DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 279 IR 007 290

AUTHOR Strasser, Alexander
TITLE Bibliographic Access in Pennsylvania.
INSTITUTION Pittsburgh Regional Library Center, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 79
NOTE 108p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bibliographies; *Interlibrary Loans; *Libraries; Library Associations; Library Cooperation; Library Networks; *Library Surveys; Literature Reviews
IDENTIFIERS *Bibliographic Access; *Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

In Pennsylvania 375 public, academic, and special libraries were surveyed in an effort to gather information concerning their interlibrary loan activity during April, 1978; personal discussions with librarians across the state were also conducted. Both sources were used in the development of recommendations for improving bibliographic access. The results from the 254 libraries that responded, which consisted of a representative cross-section of types, showed that (1) the fill rate for interlibrary loan is over 70 percent; (2) the main reason for not filling requests was that the library did not own the item; (3) over 85 percent of borrowing and lending was in-state; (4) monographs predominated over periodicals; (5) 50 percent of the activity concerned demand for material published since 1972; (6) OCLC is heavily used for bibliographic verification and as a location tool; and (7) in-state, IDS is the predominant form of delivery. Implications of the survey and the discussions with librarians led to the recommendations to develop a coordinated plan to expand access to older bibliographic records within Pennsylvania, including retrospective inputs into the OCLC data base by a greater number of libraries and the creation of a state-wide, online union list of serials; to provide incentives for libraries to share their collections; and to encourage existing agencies that produce indexes to subject collections in Pennsylvania libraries to adopt compatible formats and terminologies.
(Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171279

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS IN PENNSYLVANIA

by

Alexander Strasser

Pennsylvania Bibliographic Access Study
Alexander Strasser, Project Director
Ronal Nicholas, Research Analyst

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

State Library of Pennsylvania

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

January, 1979

Pittsburgh Regional Library Center
Chatham College, Beatty Hall
Pittsburgh, PA 15232

IR007290

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgments. I
Summary II
List of Tables III
Introduction 1
Section I - Literature Review 2
Section II - Survey of Present Interlibrary Loan Activity 5
A. Introduction 5
B. Methodology 6
1. Sample Surveyed 6
(a) Public Libraries 6
(b) Academic Libraries 6
(c) Special Libraries 6
2. Forms Used 7
(a) Distribution 7
(b) Weighting 7
C. Results 8
1. Net Lending and Borrowing 8
2. Turnaround Time 8
3. Types of Items and Subject Matter. 9
4. Age of Material 10
5. Types and Size of Libraries 10
6. Distance and In-State Activity 11
7. Network Membership 11
8. Location Identification and Bibliographic Verification 12
9. Success Rate 13
Section III - Present Modes of Bibliographic Access 15
A. Bibliographic Access by Library Type 16
1. Public Libraries (not District Library Centers). . 16
2. District Library Centers. 17
3. Regional Resource Centers 17
4. Academic Libraries 18
5. Special Libraries 18
6. Medical Libraries 19
B. Bibliographic Access through Library Cooperative Organization 20
1. Single Type Cooperatives 20
(a) Film Cooperatives 20
(b) Academic Cooperatives 20
1. COPSCAULD 20
2. ACLCP 20
3. CPC 20
4. WEBNET 21
5. LVAIC 21
6. TCLC 21

Page

(c) Health Science Cooperatives 21
2. Multitype Cooperatives 22
(a) NEPBC 22
(b) NICOP 23
(c) SLC 23
(d) PALINET 23
(e) PRLC 24
C. Bibliographic Access Via OCLC 24
D. Access to Non-Book Materials 25
1. Serials 25
2. Other Non-Book Materials 27
Section IV - Recommendations for Improving Bibliographic Access 28
A. Introduction 28
B. Recommendations 28
1. Develop a coordinated plan to expand access to older bibliographic records within Pennsylvania 28
(a) The encouragement, by the provision of appropriate incentives, of retrospective inputs into the OCLC data base by a greater number of libraries 28
(b) The development of a state-wide on-line Union List of Serials in accordance with National Standards 32
2. Provide appropriate incentives to encourage libraries to share their collections 34
3. Encourage existing agencies that produce indexes to subject collections in Pennsylvania libraries to adopt compatible formats and terminologies, thus providing improved access, especially to collections such as those of the special libraries which are not otherwise accessible 35
References 37
Appendix I - Tables
Appendix II - Survey Instruments

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the assistance and advice of the members of the Advisory Committee. Much of the value of this study should be credited to them. They should not be blamed for any of its shortcomings.

The members of the committee were:

William L. Beck, COPSCAULD
Jack M. Berk, DLCAO
Mary B. Heaton, SLA (East)
David Kaufman, PRLC
Jean Kindlin, SLA (West)
Sister Mary Dennis Lynch, TCLC
Murray S. Martin, PSU
Marianne McTighe, NEPBC
Dianne Melnychuk, PALINET
Stephen B. Folts, Exec. Dir. PRLC (Ex Officio)
Robert C. Stewart, Exec. Dir. PALINET (Ex Officio)
David R. Hoffman, State Library (Ex Officio)

Moreover, this study could not have been pursued without the active participation of librarians throughout the Commonwealth who uncomplainingly (mostly) completed the survey forms and discussed the other problems of bibliographic access.

I also wish to thank Ms. Helen Nicholas, who had the unenviable job of data entry and typed the manuscript.

SUMMARY

The interlibrary loan activities of Pennsylvania libraries have been surveyed with the ultimate objective of determining the need for improvement of bibliographic access and making such recommendations as might be found desirable.

A sample of 375 public, academic and special libraries in the Commonwealth were sent survey forms to determine specific aspects of this interlibrary loan activity during April, 1978. The 254 libraries which responded consisted of a representative cross-section of library types. In addition, personal discussions with librarians across the state were helpful in assessing their perceptions of need for improvement.

Among the results of the survey, it was found that:

1. At present, the fill rate for interlibrary loan is over 70 percent, with larger fill rates in-state than out-of-state.
2. The main reason for not filling requests was that the library did not own the item.
3. The libraries surveyed lent more than they borrowed. Patterns of net-lending and net-borrowing were generally as expected. Over 85 percent of borrowing and lending activity was in-state.
4. Monographs predominated over periodicals by about 2:1, with relatively few interlibrary loans of other types of material. Originals were lent more than photocopies by about the same ratio.
5. The most recent material was most in demand with about 50 percent of the activity concerned with material published since 1972, varying according to subject.
6. OCLC is heavily used, both for bibliographic verification and as a location tool.
7. In-state, IDS is the predominant form of delivery.

Implications of the survey, and of discussions with librarians, as well as considerations of technological and economic feasibilities led to the following recommendations:

1. Develop a coordinated plan to expand access to older bibliographic records within Pennsylvania, this plan to include:

   a) The encouragement, by the provision of appropriate incentives, of retrospective inputs into the OCLC data base by a greater number of libraries.

   b) The development of a state-wide, on-line Union List of Serials in accordance with national standards.

2. Provide appropriate incentives to encourage libraries to share their collections.

3. Encourage existing agencies that produce indexes to subject collections in Pennsylvania libraries to adopt compatible formats and terminologies, thus providing improved access, especially to collections such as those of the special libraries which are not otherwise accessible.

Adopting these recommendations will improve bibliographic access and promote resource sharing which is becoming more indispensable as library costs rise and demand for services increases.

List of Tables

TABLE NUMBER	TITLE
I	Replies to the Bibliographic Access Study Survey by Library Category
II	Weighting Factors for Library Data
III	Total Lending and Borrowing for Most Recent Full Year
IV	Net Borrowing and Lending among Types of Libraries
V	Total ILL Borrowing and Lending Transactions - Turnaround Times
VI	In-State ILL Activity
VII	Turnaround Time in Lending Library
VIII	Turnaround Time in Borrowing Library
IX	Type of Items Borrowed and Loaned
X	Subject Characteristics of Items Borrowed and Loaned
XI	Subject Characteristics of Items Loaned In-State
XII	Subject Characteristics of Items Borrowed In-State
XIII	Types of Items Lent in Various Subjects
XIV	Types of Items Borrowed in Various Subjects
XV	Publication Year By Subject - Total Lending
XVI	Publication Year By Subject - Total Borrowing
XVII	Publication Year of Items Lent, Total
XVIII	Publication Year of Items Borrowed, Total
XIX	Publication Year By Subject - Total Monograph Borrowing
XX	Publication Year By Subject - Total Monograph Lending
XXI	Publication Year By Subject - Total Periodical Borrowing
XXII	Publication Year By Subject - Total Periodical Lending
XXIII	ILL Activity By Various Types of Libraries
XXIV	Borrowing and Lending as a Function of Library Size
XXV	In-State ILL Activity
XXVI	ILL Activity within 25 Miles
XXVII	ILL Activity within Same Network
XXVIII	Borrowing Library's Reason for Choice of Lender
XXIX	Bibliographic Verification Sources
XXX	Borrowers' Use of OCLC vs Other Forms of Bibliographic Verification
XXXI	Consortia and Other Sources Used for Location Identification
XXXII	Borrowers' Means of Location Identification
XXXIII	Effect of Access to OCLC Terminals on Location Identification by Borrowing Libraries
XXXIV	Request Transmission Medium
XXXV	Fill Rate
XXXVI	Form of Loan - Lending Library
XXXVII	Form of Loan - Borrowing Library
XXXVIII	Loan Delivery Method to Borrowing Library
XXXIX	Loan Delivery Method by Lending Library
XL	Reason Not Filled - Borrowing Library
XLI	Reason Not Filled - Lending Library
XLII	Unfilled Request Disposition - Lending Library
XLIII	Unfilled Request Disposition - Borrowing Library
XLIV	OCLC Membership in Pennsylvania By Library Type

BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS IN PENNSYLVANIA

INTRODUCTION

By now it is a commonplace to state that a goal of our post-industrial society is to provide maximum access to information to all persons regardless of their economic or social status or their place of residence. As with all such goals, its fulfillment must be considered an ideal which has to be approached over a period of time which depends on economic and technological constraints. However, even though we may not complete the task, we are obligated to start and proceed as far as we are able. We recognize, of course, that information is not exclusively what may be found in the contents of our libraries, but this study must perforce constrain itself to consider just that world. Not only that, but as we view library development in Pennsylvania we shall focus upon only one of the goals of library development in the Commonwealth. (1) In the context of the goal of encouraging the establishment of library cooperative activities among all types of libraries, our major consideration is the improvement of the interlibrary loan function.

One aspect of interlibrary loan is the ability of the borrowing library to determine where a particular item may be found. This, of course, is related to the knowledge that a possible lending library is willing to part temporarily with the item in such a way that the borrower could receive it without undue delay. This consideration involves the establishment of an interlibrary lending code and delivery system which help optimize both fulfillment rate and turn around time. However, without access to knowledge of locations, interlibrary loan cannot succeed despite a good code and highly efficient delivery system.

In this study we have asked some questions such as:

1. What kinds of materials are needed in interlibrary loan?
2. How well do existing location services meet needs?
3. How might location services best be improved?
4. How can holdings information best be provided?

ILL librarians have, up to now, relied for bibliographic access information on such traditional tools as union catalogs of books and monographs, on union lists of serials, as well as on their own knowledge and experience. These traditional tools have in recent years been supplemented by such data bases as that of OCLC, Inc. and also to some extent by interconnection of automated circulation systems when those systems are manufactured by the same manufacturer. (2)

It must be emphasized, however, that bibliographic access is a process, not a set of "access tools" sitting on the shelves of the ILL department or data bases residing in the memories of their computers. The tools are, of course, necessary for the process but only the librarian who uses them with understanding and dedication can really make the process work.

Thus, bibliographic access will be improved when better tools are provided to library staff who are ready and willing to use them. It is for this reason that the development of an appropriate ILL code, the provision of more sophisticated finding tools, the rationalization of our Regional Resource Center system and the improvement of the Interlibrary Delivery Service cannot be compartmentalized. The present study focuses on the improvement of the access system but we cannot lose sight of the other aspects of interlibrary loan and the studies that concern them.

The present study, after a preliminary literature review, has concentrated on an analysis of current interlibrary loan traffic which, in determining present patterns, provides an assessment of how present access systems are fulfilling their tasks and how they might be improved with optimum cost-effectiveness.

Following this, an overview of the various library cooperatives in Pennsylvania leads us to a number of recommendations to improve bibliographic access realistically, given the financial constraints which are not likely to diminish.

SECTION I - LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on interlibrary loan is vast and has been reviewed and re-reviewed periodically. We have not attempted a comprehensive review but have, instead, chosen to consider a number of recent reports which have particular relevance to our concerns. In the summary which follows, we discuss the more general aspects of the reports, leaving particulars to be considered at pertinent parts of our study.

The genesis of the present work may be traced to the recommendations of the Drexel Study (3), one of which was the development of a Pennsylvania Union Catalog. "Individual libraries and their cooperative organizations should work toward the creation of a combined (union) catalog of all library holdings in the state. Through such a statewide union catalog a user or librarian can find the location of any work and, if at more than one location, the most economical one to borrow from." (4) Our study considers the implications of this broad statement and proceeds to assess the extent to which it can and should be implemented in the interest of economy and optimum service to users. "Goal F - Encouraging the Establishment of Library Cooperative Activities Among All Types of Libraries" which is envisioned in the 1976-1981 Pennsylvania Library Development Plan (5) draws upon the Drexel Plan and recommends adoption of "appropriate" sections as one of its objectives.

The foregoing documents have had an honorable ancestry as exemplified by the Blasingame Report of 1967. (6) While this report emphasizes the research orientation of the Academic and Special library communities, there are some

interlibrary loan statistics for the early 60's which may be compared with current data which we have accumulated. For example, a number of conclusions about net lenders and net borrowers, to be described below, provide an interesting comparison with our data.

The literature on interlibrary loan and bibliographic access may be considered from a number of points of view. For example, there are descriptions of various systems and of the development of microform catalogs, book catalogs and other tools. In addition, there are a number of studies which approach interlibrary loan and networking problems from a comprehensive standpoint. Outstanding among the latter is a series of papers by the Western Interstate Library Coordinating Organization (WILCO) (7). This group of reports emphasized cost studies and the methodology of determining cost of interlibrary loan and technical processing. While the results of this study, which are applied to the vast geography of seventeen Western states and British Columbia, are not necessarily applicable to a single Eastern state, the survey methodology was well-conceived and structured and some of its procedures were adapted to our survey.

Another study which is pertinent to our own is one which has been conducted by NELINET. (8) The primary purpose of this project was to determine how load-leveling could be accomplished, whereby lending and borrowing by various libraries are structured so that most libraries would find themselves borrowing and lending to roughly the same degree. An ILL baseline statistical survey was designed and distributed. The methodology of the survey was also helpful in the design of our own survey. The NELINET survey was distributed to all of their members and to an approximately equal number of non-members. The survey addressed such questions as the net-lending - net-borrowing patterns of large and small libraries, the flow of traffic among types of libraries, the use of OCLC, the age of materials, turnaround times, traffic within and without the region and other questions to which answers are also useful in our Pennsylvania context.

These two projects which were more extensive than our bibliographic access study, were directed toward different immediate objectives, but the goal of improving the interlibrary loan system in the region or state was the same.

As an example of what has been done to improve access and promote cooperation elsewhere, we may cite the example of MINITEX and WILS. (9) MINITEX (Minnesota Interlibrary Teletype Exchange) is a centralized service of the state of Minnesota which "attempts to provide maximum, equitable accessibility to all library resources in the state for any Minnesota citizen." One of the major accomplishments of MINITEX was to produce the Minnesota Union List of Serials (MULS) which contains over 75,000 titles in MARC II format and contains the holdings of 120 academic, public, government, medical, seminary and special libraries in over 200 locations (10), updated regularly on microfilm. MINITEX involves much more than a serials data base since it provides many more components of interlibrary cooperation. MINITEX, originally funded as an experimental project by foundation and/or LSCA Title III grants, has proved sufficiently valuable to be supported on an ongoing basis by the Minnesota state government.

MINTEX has also provided the paradigm for WILS (Wisconsin Interlibrary Loan Service). Just as MINITEX initially was based on the library resources of the University of Minnesota, so WILS was established with the University of Wisconsin as the primary resource. WILS, too, emphasizes photocopy of periodical articles. WILS and MINITEX have entered into a reciprocal arrangement to interface their networks. To further this process, they have exchanged microfilm copies of their respective Union Catalogs as well as their published serials lists.

The WILS and MINITEX experience, while instructive, should not be viewed as the model for Pennsylvania. In the first place, both Minnesota and Wisconsin have their major library collections concentrated in their respective state universities. The collections in Pennsylvania are much more diversified,with several universities and public library systems having large collections which could be subject to resource sharing. Secondly, differences in state commitment for funding are such that expansion of bibliographic access in Pennsylvania will have to take on its own unique mode.

The ideas of networking, of interlibrary cooperation, of the use of all kinds of modern communication and computer technology to assist in the cooperative operation of libraries, have been considered for many years and have produced many improvements and proposals for improvement over the years. For example, libraries have been using the teletype to communicate with each other for many years and certainly that technology is no longer uncomfortable.

As far as interlibrary loan is concerned a Union Catalog of books and Union List of Serials covering as large a territory as possible, and as many libraries and types of libraries as possible have been considered the major desiderata. Responses to this both at local levels and at the national level have been forthcoming in many compilations from relatively small local lists to major compilations such as the National Union Catalog and Register of Additional Locations. Formats have varied from combined card catalogs to on-line computer communication systems. Types of information supplied have also varied from bare bones location information such as could be supplied by a numerical register, to full MARC bibliographic information.

An example of the former is the Louisiana Numerical Register. (11) As a location tool, the LNR contains only the Library of Congress Card Number and an alphabetical location symbol for each of the libraries reporting. The coverage includes seventeen academic and two medical libraries in addition to the Louisiana State Library and the New Orleans Public Library. The second edition of the LNR which has been produced on computer output microfiche lists 1,200,000 locations for 550,000 titles. Success rate for searches is claimed to be more than 50 percent. Academic libraries have contributed 79 percent of the locations while they have conducted only 30 percent of the searches.

The limitations of such a finding tool are evident. The principal advantage is apparently the relatively low cost of producing and maintaining the Register.

At the other end of the spectrum are cooperative systems such as ILLINET and some of its components which supply a large file and a statewide interlibrary loan system. (12) ILLINET is a statewide hierarchical network encompassing local school, public, academic and special libraries. At the top of the hierarchy are four research and reference centers (Chicago Public, University of Ill., Southern Illinois University and the State Library). There are also two special resource centers of last resort: The University of Chicago and John Crerar Libraries. There are eighteen distinct library systems which cover the whole state with each required to have a unified means of location of total holdings. Basic to the system is the central role of the State Library which has a strong collection and which supervises reimbursement by the state for cooperative activities. For example, the Research and Reference Centers each receive a $40,000 basic grant, $1.10 for each item searched and $2.20 for each item sent.

The individual systems borrow from one another on a lateral basis with some having particular subject strengths. If necessary, they can go to any of the four Research and Reference Centers.

Bibliographic access is aided by the microfilmed version of the State Library Catalog which is distributed to each system and updated quarterly. Other microfilmed bibliographic aids include the Union List of Serials of the University of Illinois as well as its Union Catalog.

Automation in Illinois is described in the April, 1978 issue of Illinois Libraries, edited by Adrian Jones. (13) Descriptions by various authors of systems installed in Illinois units all emphasize the capabilities of these systems to provide ongoing support to many library functions. Several of the individual networks have opted to acquire the on-line circulation system of a particular vendor, CL Systems, Inc. These circulation systems have begun to be tied together so that each may be accessed by any one. With this capability, the borrowing library can determine not only whether the prospective lender owns the item, but also if it is on the shelf.

Description of various library automation schemes abound in the literature. Networking schemes and automation will be discussed further in this report where their merits can be compared in light of our recommendations for improvement of bibliographic access.

SECTION II - Survey of Present Interlibrary Loan Activity

A. Introduction

Present interlibrary loan activity is, among other things, dependent on bibliographic access as it exists today. Thus, the adequacy or inadequacy of bibliographic access will be reflected in the modes of interlibrary loan. Delivery methods, codes, and the willingness of libraries to lend also affect interlibrary loan activity, and any survey of such activity would reflect the influence of all such factors. However, many aspects of present bibliographic access can be deduced from the results

of a base line survey of interlibrary loan activity which indicates the present impact of bibliographic access methods. Therefore, one of the first activities of the present study was the design and implementation of a survey of interlibrary loan activity among libraries in the state. The survey was designed to provide a sample of public, academic, special, institutional and government libraries. Libraries omitted from the sample include the school libraries, and those of proprietary schools. However, the interlibrary loan activities of these institutions are, to some extent, reflected in the lending and borrowing of the surveyed libraries.

B. Methodology

1. Sample Surveyed

(a) Public Libraries

Sampling of the public libraries was done selectively. Survey forms were sent to all the Regional Resource Centers and District Library Centers. Other libraries were sampled in each county so that urban, suburban and rural areas of the Commonwealth would all be represented. In this way, every county was represented by at least one but no more than four libraries.

(b) Academic Libraries

The survey sample of academic libraries was more comprehensive. It included all state-owned colleges and universities, all state related universities and all community colleges. In addition, we also included the private colleges and universities and private junior colleges and theological seminaries. However, we included only the main library in any university and none of the branch campus libraries.

(c) Special Libraries

The list of special libraries was chosen from the two directories of the Special Libraries Association, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh Chapters, and Western Pennsylvania Resources published by PRLC. Special libraries were chosen in various categories including Medical, Industrial, Commercial, Government, Non-Profit Organizations, and specialized schools. We attempted to diversify the types of institutions queried. For example, among the medical and hospital libraries some are large general hospital libraries, some are libraries connected with medical schools and some are smaller libraries operating in the context of specialized institutions. For industrial and commercial organizations, the SLA directories were sampled randomly. This technique was also employed to choose the Government and Non-Profit organizations and special schools to be queried.

The entire list of candidate libraries was discussed with the Advisory Committee which helped with additional valuable suggestions and comments. Members of the Advisory Committee were also very helpful in urging the libraries in their constituencies to complete the survey. As a result, 254 of the 375 libraries queried (68%) replied to the survey. In view of the fact that this was a survey of activity for one specific month

and that thus it was not feasible to send follow-up letters, the results are quite gratifying. Table I lists the replies received by library category.*

2. Forms Used

(a) Distribution

As mentioned above, the survey was conducted during one month. Forms (See Appendix II) were distributed in the middle of March and were to be filled out during the month of April, 1978. The forms were designed to determine the pertinent parameters of interlibrary loan. The forms designed by NELINET (8) and WILCO (14) were helpful in providing guidelines as to format and content. After a preliminary set of forms was designed, they were sent to three libraries which had previously consented to try them out for a week. The librarians provided many useful suggestions which were incorporated in a second draft which was sent to the Advisory Committee. At a meeting early in March, the Advisory Committee and Project Director discussed the survey forms, cover letter and definitions. After the final format was agreed to, the forms were mailed to the 375 libraries which had been selected to receive them. Copies of the forms and other materials sent to the libraries are displayed in the Appendix. Since one form was to be used for each ILL transaction, a sufficient number had to be sent to each library, based on an estimate of its interlibrary loan traffic. Data for the public libraries on an annual basis were available in the reports of Pennsylvania library statistics. (15) Furthermore, in order not to burden the larger libraries, no library was required to fill out more than one hundred borrowing and one hundred lending forms. All libraries were to report their total number of transactions of each kind for the month on a summary sheet so that suitable correction factors might be applied to their reported statistics. This technique has also been applied to the data reported by academic and special libraries, whose prospective lending and borrowing for one month could only be the subject of an educated guess.

(b) Weighting

Weighting factors for the data from various libraries are detailed in Table II. They were calculated from the summary supplied by the library as follows: If all of the individual survey sheets were returned in a particular category and the summary indicated that more transactions were conducted, then the data were multiplied by the ratio of total transactions to those reported. For example, the University of Pittsburgh Library returned 100 lending forms (the total requested) but indicated that actually they loaned 194 items during the month. The lending data were thus multiplied by 1.9 to reflect their actual activity. On the other hand, they returned less than 100 borrowing forms, which detailed all of their borrowing activity and thus there was a unity weighting factor for this aspect.

* Tables may be found in Appendix I.

C. Results

1. Net Lending and Borrowing

Data from the summary sheet have also been used to tabulate the net lending and borrowing activity of the various libraries. Tables III and IV summarize these statistics. Obviously, those libraries such as Regional Resource Centers and District Library Centers, which are by law or regulation expected to be resources for others are net lenders. The academic community as a whole is fairly evenly balanced between net lending and net borrowing. The state colleges, community colleges and other colleges and universities as a group have a lending percentage of 52; that is, their loans are 52 percent of their total interlibrary loan activity. The most clear cut examples of roles as net lenders and net borrowers are those played by the special libraries. Despite the relatively small number of such libraries represented in the statistics, the dichotomy between the libraries of non-profit institutions and those of the for-profit institutions is evident. Every one of the non-profit libraries is a net lender; every one of the for-profit libraries is a net borrower. The implications of these statistics for bibliographic access will be considered in conjunction with other data.

2. Turnaround Time

One of the first things a patron wants to know when the librarian tells him that the item he wants is "not available in our library but we can borrow it from another library" is: how long will it take. The need for rapid service and the tolerance of the patron for delays are not going to be addressed. However, let use see what kind of service borrowing and lending libraries were able to render during April.

The borrowing and lending turnaround time data listed in Table V are the aggregate both for in-state and out-of-state loans. In-state ILL transactions, as indicated in Table VI, amount to about 87% of the total for all libraries. Table VII shows that the turnaround time within the lending libraries does not depend on the eventual destination of the item. For borrowing, however, within-state turnaround times are somewhat less than those experienced overall, as shown in Table VIII. Out-of-state transactions alone were determined to have an average turnaround time of 10.2 days, compared with the 8.9 days for in-state loans.

In considering these statistics we note that while it takes a lending library about two days to dispose of a request, the average time between a borrowing library's request and its receipt of the item is about seven days for one received from an in-state library and about eight days for one from an out-of-state source. The scenario thus seems to be:

Time for processing patron's request at borrowing library: 2 days
Time in transit: 5 days in-state, 6 days out-of-state
Time for processing in lending library: 2 days
Total: 9 days in-state
10 days out-of-state

As far as time in transit is concerned, improved bibliographic access is significant only insofar as it may make it possible to obtain materials from sources close at hand rather than at some distant point.

The fact that out-of-state items take only about a day longer in transit than those from within the state would indicate that any system designed to increase the percentage of in-state items would be of no more than marginal value in improving turnaround time.

3. Types of Items and Subject Matter

Knowledge of the type of item requested is, of course, one of the keys to improvement of bibliographic access. By and large our survey indicates that monographs are lent and borrowed about twice as often as periodicals. The differences among libraries may be seen in Table IX, in which the entries are all in terms of percentages of the total activity of the particular library group.

As Table IX indicates, there is general uniformity with regard to the borrowing and lending activities of most of the libraries. The special libraries, however, are exceptional in that they tend to borrow periodicals much more than other types of materials while they are called upon to lend monographs more.

Another noteworthy point is the heavy reliance on periodicals of the medical libraries, both as borrowers and lenders. The medical libraries have recognized this fact and in their bibliographic access projects have produced a number of aids such as regional Union Lists of Serials. It was somewhat surprising to find that the academic community in general depends on monographs more than on serials. This situation would be expected to depend on the academic field, however, and one would hypothesize that the humanities are more monograph dependent while the sciences use periodicals more. That this is the case is documented in the tabulation of the subject activities of the various types of libraries (see Table X).

Here again, the similarities between lending and borrowing activity are apparent. Differences occur among special libraries and government and institutional libraries. The significance of these differences is not very great, however, because of the small sample sizes in those cases.

We had hypothesized that the type of items involved in interlibrary loan would be dependent on the subject matter. As Tables XI and XII show, there is some substance to the hypothesis.

The problem of definition of subject matter was solved by arbitrarily defining the various subjects in the instructions to the librarians. "Old Fiction", for example, was defined as any adult fiction published before 1970 and any later fiction currently out of print. "Contemporary Fiction" was defined as any fiction published in the 1970's and currently in print. The problem of what fiction to categorize as "literature" was left to the individual librarian. See the Appendix for further definitions as detailed in the instructions.

Tables XIII and XIV show that in science and technology, the periodical literature is more heavily used than are monographs. But for our sample, at least, the use of monographs in interlibrary loan of science-technology material is substantial. Other subject matter is approached to a great extent in the monographs with much lesser involvement of periodicals. Overall, monographs predominate in interlibrary lending and borrowing over periodicals by about 2:1.

4. Age of Material

The age of material involved in interlibrary loan is obviously highly pertinent to the problem of bibliographic access. For example, the question of the adequacy of an on-line system inputting current material comes to the fore. To what extent is it necessary or desirable to input locations in a system like OCLC retrospectively? The current survey has not answered these questions definitively, but the data presented in the following Tables (Nos. XV and XVI) are significant and helpful.

Clearly, the notion that older material is not being used is untenable. Of course, the newer material is accessed to a greater extent, but these data indicate that we cannot neglect material which is older.

Ages of materials borrowed and lent presumably depend both on the subjects of the items involved and on the type of library. In Tables XV - XVIII we show this dependency. As expected, we find science and technology using the more recent materials, with humanities and social sciences making more use of older materials than do the sciences. Nevertheless, even among the humanities about 25% of the material dates from 1974 or later. There are no significant differences between the lending and borrowing patterns.

Another way of looking at the data is to consider the age distribution of monographs and periodicals as a function of subject and the following tables (Tables XIX - XXII) give details of these data. The cumulative data show that use of older material is not negligible, even in the sciences where one might conjecture that the scientist wants only the latest material.

5. Types and Size of Libraries

Our data show that interlibrary loan traffic among various types of libraries is less common than ILL traffic among libraries of the same type, as indicated in Table XXIII. By and large, the libraries lend to the same type they borrow from, but there are some significant differences. For example, District Library Centers are sources for the public libraries almost exclusively but they borrow about 29% of their material from academic libraries. Academic libraries, in general, deal with other academics both as borrowers and lenders, dealing with other libraries relatively less.

Another possible problem with interlibrary loan is the size of the library being borrowed from. It has often been remarked that large

libraries, in addition to being net lenders, are often slower in their response than the smaller ones. Our data (Table IV) do not completely confirm this conjecture, but the Public Libraries do have a smaller lag time than do either the Regional Resource Centers or the District Library Centers which are larger. In any event, it is of considerable interest to know the distribution pattern of lending and borrowing as a function of library size. We arbitrarily divided our population into three size classes: those libraries with more than 250,000 volumes, those with less than 50,000 volumes, and the ones in between with 50,000-250,000 volumes. Table XXIV summarizes the borrowing and lending patterns in terms of library size. It is noteworthy that in about one-fourth of the cases there was no indication of library size, either because it was "unknown" or there simply was no attempt to enter the data. If libraries are to consider the size of the institutions from which they borrow, it would seem that those data should be readily at hand or known to the inter-library loan librarian. Overall, the data indicate that while about 40 percent of the borrowing was done from large libraries, only 14 percent of the loans were made to such libraries. The small libraries are borrowed from 6 percent of the time while about 36 percent of the loans are made to them.

6. Distance and In-State Activity

Present bibliographic access to Pennsylvania materials is reflected in the proportion of borrowing and lending within the state. Our study shows that about 84 percent of materials lent were lent to in-state libraries while borrowing overall from in-state libraries constituted about 91 percent of such activity, although only 80 percent of the borrowing requests were from in-state. Table XXV shows how the various types of libraries differed in this respect.

The Regional Resource Centers data, which included reports from the Pennsylvania State University, Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, and the Pennsylvania State Library, shows these libraries borrowed about 26 percent of their material from out-of-state. The general academic community, which represent about 24 percent of this lending sample, lent about 19 percent of its material out-of-state.

Other location information elicited included the distance of the borrowing or lending library. This indicated that slightly more than half of ILL activity, both borrowing and lending, occurs between libraries which are more than 25 miles apart. Table XXVI gives the details.

7. Network Membership

Whether or not a library is in the same network as another with which it conducts some ILL activity is, of course, indicative of the possibility of the use of that network to produce access. The question we asked was "Is the borrowing (or lending) library a member of your district or of a network to which you belong?" The answers to this question, summarized in Table XXVII, do not necessarily indicate that the network relationship was in fact used in the ILL transaction.

However, such a relationship indicates the possibility of such use. We see from the Table that about two-thirds of both borrowing and lending activity takes place among members of the same network. This being the case, improving and updating the Union Lists and Union Catalogs either within the networks or within limited areas could prove highly beneficial.

8. Location Identification and Bibliographic Verification

A question that goes to the heart of bibliographic access is the one in which we asked the librarian what the reason was for choice of a particular lending library. The possibilities could be that the local procedure required it (as when a local public library has to make its request from its own DLC) or that the librarian knew that a certain library had the item or that it was a "likely" source. Finally, the source may indeed have been identified. In fact, only some 57 percent of the items were claimed to have been identified. Details of the data are shown in Table XXVIII. Note that the data for in-state borrowing are substantially the same as those for the entire sample.

Ideally, the borrowing library has a two-fold identification task. First of all, it should verify the bibliographic citation of the item and secondly, it should determine the location of the item. Some access tools such as a Numerical Register are of value only as location tools while others can supply a full bibliographic record in addition to locations. As indicated in Table XXVIII, slightly more than half of the locations were identified by means of some location tool while about one-third were sent to a particular lender because of procedural requirements or because the particular lender was known to have the item. The remainder of the requests were apparently sent out by some sort of guess work, i.e., the source was "likely" to have the material. Our survey did not attempt to isolate these various approaches, but it would be interesting to know the percentage of success attributable to various methods of location verification.

Even before location is verified, it is necessary to know specifically what item is being requested. We asked the lending libraries what sources the borrowers used to verify bibliographically. Answers to this are displayed in Table XXIX.

We see that in almost half of the cases, the borrower did not verify bibliographically or, at least, the lender did not know whether such verification was made. Of the verification tools used, OCLC was the most popular even though it was used only about 19 percent of the time overall and 18 percent in-state. Use of OCLC in the District Library Centers and the State Colleges was slightly higher. Assuming that OCLC would be most valuable for items published in the last five years--granting that there are also some retrospective data--this tool might have had available about 40 percent of the items lent or borrowed. An educated guess is thus that OCLC has been used for bibliographic verification of about one-half of the items for which it may have the data. See Table XXX which shows

the relative use of OCLC and other means of bibliographic verification for those cases where some means of bibliographic verification was reported.

After bibliographic verification, location identification is necessary. Sources used as reported by lending library and by the borrowing libraries are listed in Table XXXI.

From the Table it is apparent that the two most important sources of location information are the OCLC terminals and such local catalogs and Union Lists as are available. The relatively small percentages attributable to the various consortia may be due to the restricted nature of their membership or the relatively small number of libraries in our sample which belong to a particular consortium. Table XXXII shows the dependence of the borrower on OCLC and the local catalog for location identification for the various types of libraries. For in-state locations, the OCLC terminal was used for 40 percent and the local catalog for about 31 percent of the identified locations. This Table does not include those instances in which the location means was either unidentified or not reported. About half of the out-of-state locations were identified by the borrowers with the assistance of the OCLC system. Table XXXIII also indicates that the use of the OCLC terminal is a major means of location identification. The survey thus emphasizes the importance of this tool and its use in conjunction with local sources.

One of the factors which determines the turnaround time is the medium used to transmit the request. The media available are mail, TWX, telephone, and a number of others such as messenger service. Despite its relative slowness, our data show that the mails are most used, with TWX and telephone next. Table XXIV indicates the relative frequency.

9. Success Rate

The previous data were, in a sense, preliminary to the study. In the final analysis, we want to know how successful the system is--what percentage of requests were filled and, if possible, the reasons for unfilled requests. The tabulations which follow show a much larger proportion of "pending" requests at the borrowing library than at the lenders. The reason for this lies in the method of the survey. Since libraries were asked to report only their activity during one month, borrowing requests sent out during the last week of that month would tend to remain in the "pending" file by the time the month was over. Lending requests, being disposed of within a day or two of receipt, would be much less likely to be pending at the end of the month. It may be seen from Table XXXV that the libraries satisfied the requests of more than two-thirds of their patrons. In fact, if the pending cases are omitted, the in-state fill rate averages over 78 percent for the borrowing libraries.

The form in which the loan was made is also of interest. Photocopies usually do not have to be returned and, moreover, the original

remains available for the lending library's patrons. Lending the original, however, is not likely to involve the library with copyright problems and might even be less expensive. One form which is still not very popular as a loan, indicated in Tables XXXVI and XXXVII, is the microform.

While the method of delivery does not directly concern bibliographic access, librarians will naturally tend to favor those sources from which delivery is likely to be most efficient. In-state the most usual delivery modes for interlibrary loan are mail and IDS. Out-of-state ILL is delivered almost exclusively by mail (see Tables XXXVIII and XXXIX).

The reasons given for not filling a request are highly pertinent to bibliographic access. When the putative lending library replies that it does not own a particular item, the borrower misdirected his request. Knowledge of the holdings of possible lenders would prevent this type of misdirection. A "lost" item is similarly suspect if the holdings information source, such as a Union Catalog, is not updated frequently enough. When a lender replies that the item is in use or does not circulate, using a simple holdings record would not enable the borrowing librarian to avoid non-receipts. One possible solution which has been applied at a number of places is multi-library access to on-line circulation systems. However, let us see what the situation is at present, as indicated by Tables XL and XLI.

The results are remarkably similar from both the lending and borrowing points of view. Half of the unfilled requests are because the item is not owned by the lending library. Bibliographic verification seems to be less of a problem since very few respondents checked off "not identified" as a reason for not lending, perhaps because of lending libraries', ILL Librarians' willingness to take the time to find the items. The "in use" category applies more to monographs than to journals from which articles can be photocopied. As mentioned before, it would undoubtedly help to have interconnected on-line circulation systems so that the borrower could find out if the item is in use or even if it is non-circulating. This solution, however, is of limited value in Pennsylvania because of its cost and other problems involved in interconnection of computer systems.

The data for out-of-state libraries is somewhat different in that the "not owned" category is considerably less. It may be that more attention is paid to identifying locations for out-of-state ILL. Not surprisingly,out-of-state libraries more frequently refuse a loan because the item "does not circulate".

Finally, when a lender cannot fill a request, what does he do? From Table XLII we see that about half the time the request is returned to the borrowing library and that only the District Library Centers, Public Libraries, and the Medical Libraries redirect the request to some other lender to any appreciable extent.

When the lender returns the unfilled request, the borrowing library may re-request it from some other source or it may just notify its patron that the item was unavailable. According to our data, the items are re-requested about 75 percent of the time as indicated in Table XLIII. One might call the relative frequency of re-requests a persistence factor, and may also reflect the librarian's estimate of the needs or demands of the patron.

SECTION III - Present Modes of Bibliographic Access

As Table XXXV shows, interlibrary loan in Pennsylvania is a viable and successful program, with an indicated fill rate of over 70 percent. The results of the survey also point to a number of problems whose solution should enable the libraries of the Commonwealth to provide even better service. Among these problems are: 1) The sharp dichotomy between net lenders and net borrowers shown in Table IV, which indicates that less than ten percent of the libraries at present have their borrowing and lending functions in balance. With a new interlibrary loan code that encourages equalization between net lenders and net borrowers, a more efficient bibliographic access system is needed to make this a reality. 2) The fact that the largest percentages of unfilled requests, as indicated in Tables XL and XLI, are because ownership is not known. The importance here of better holdings information which would be provided by improved bibliographic access is obvious.

In general, bibliographic access at present is provided in a number of more or less conventional ways. First, there are the various Union Catalogs and Union Lists of Serials, published in various forms under the aegis of a number of organizations and consortia. Second, there are presently four consortia with Union Catalogs which are providing bibliographic and location information services. These are the PRLC Clearinghouse for Interlibrary Loan in Pittsburgh, PALINET and Union Library Catalogue of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, Northeast Pennsylvania Bibliographic Center in Wilkes-Barre, and the Tri-State College Library Cooperative in Rosemont. (These services are described in more detail later in the report.)

Finally, there are nation-wide services in various forms, e.g. on-line with OCLC, microfiche and hard copy provided by the National Union Catalog and the Register of Additional Locations.

In addition to these specific tools, there are the various resource guides such as "Western Pennsylvania Resources" published by PRLC and the library directories published by the Special Libraries Association chapters in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. The guides are important as a source for leads in subject searches.

Problems of bibliographic access vary with the type and size of library involved in the ILL process as the following summary indicates.

A. Bibliographic Access by Library Type

1. Public Libraries (not District Library Centers)

Sixty-two Public Libraries returned survey forms. As noted in the discussion of the survey, we attempted to include a broad sample of all libraries from various areas of the Commonwealth. As a result, the statistics represent large and small public libraries in rural, metropolitan and suburban areas. Thus we find an average of 549 items borrowed annually, with a range of 72-3847. As far as loans are concerned, the average of 133 items is produced by a range of 0-1620 items, with about 21 percent of the libraries lending nothing at all. Problems of bibliographic access for the public, non-DLC, libraries are ones which should encourage them to lend more.

We have had discussions with a number of librarians from this type of library, and in general they do not feel that their bibliographic access problems are serious. They depend on the services of their District Library Centers and use them as their source of interlibrary loans.

Although the individual public libraries do not have national finding tools such as OCLC terminals or the NUC, they may have a local Union Catalog or Union List of Serials to help them. In at least one instance (the Central Pennsylvania District) each of the local libraries has weekly time reserved on the OCLC terminal at the District Center. The holdings of the individual public libraries are listed in some instances in Union Catalogs or Union Lists of Serials of the membership of their own Districts. However, only 14 of the 27 Districts have such Union Catalogs and there are only 17 District-wide Union Lists of Serials (16). Thus access to holdings information is spotty, at best.

Union Catalogs held in the District Centers are there for the convenience and use of the interlibrary loan function. For example, the Central Pennsylvania District has a Union Catalog which includes the holdings of all six major libraries in its district. These libraries supply the District with main entry cards as their acquisitions are processed, thus keeping the catalog of about 100,000 titles up-to-date. A library in the District sends its ILL requests to the District Center which, through its Union Catalog, fills 40-50% of such requests within the District. With this system, one library can access the holdings of another only through the District Center; providing direct access requires that the Union Catalog be available at each library. It is this form of access which will be available when the District-wide COM Catalog being developed at the West Chester DLC is completed at the end of 1979. Using the OCLC archival tapes and the data base from an available computer produced book catalog, a set of computer output microfilm is being produced which will be distributed to all libraries in the District. These libraries will then be able to conduct their ILL transactions without the need of the intermediary services of the DLC.

District Centers do not have access to the holdings of other Districts except insofar as they inquire directly. As a result, there is not much borrowing between District Centers. Load leveling requires that a network be a distributed network; that is, that each member of the network be able

to access other members directly. A hierarchical network, such as the system in which public libraries access their District Library Center, which may, in turn, go to one of the Regional Resource Centers will almost inevitably lead to the situation where the lower levels of the hierarchy depend on the higher levels. As a result, the latter are net lenders while the former are the net borrowers.

2. District Library Centers

District Library Centers at present have access to a number of tools and services which are not directly available to the public libraries in their districts. All twenty-seven of the DLC's are on-line with OCLC and thus enter their recent and current acquisitions into that data base as a by-product of their cataloging function. Retrospective material, however, is not generally entered into OCLC by the DLC's. As an example of the location searching possibilities for one DLC in Western Pennsylvania we can cite the following sequence of events: When an ILL request for a monograph is received from one of the public libraries in its district, it first searches in its own Union Catalog to determine availability somewhere in its own District. Failing this, the librarian attempts to get the material from a local college (which is just across the road). Next source consulted is the OCLC terminal and finally, a request is relayed to the PRLC Clearinghouse for Interlibrary Loan.

In addition to these sources, the District Library Centers theoretically can use each other's collections, but our interviews with a number of their directors indicated that, by and large, they do not. The reason for this is that with the exception of whatever is available on OCLC, DLC's do not have any means of knowing each others' holdings. They can communicate with each other by TWX and, of course, telephone, but these do not substitute for holdings information.

3. Regional Resource Centers

The next (and final) level in the Pennsylvania hierarchy is a group of four Regional Resource Centers, which includes the two largest public libraries (Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh and Free Library of Philadelphia), the library of The Pennsylvania State University and the Pennsylvania State Library. As the Regional Resource Center program was originally conceived about twenty years ago, each of these libraries was to develop subject strengths in a number of areas and their resources were to be shared statewide.

A major study of the concept and effectiveness of the Regional Resource Center program has been conducted under the auspices of the State Library by the Public Administration Service of Chicago. All four have been major net lenders. They all have had major financial problems, some of which stem from their need to satisfy their own constituencies in addition to functioning as statewide resources. The two public libraries serve as District Library Centers in their own districts in addition to serving their own clientele. The Pennsylvania State University Library has to serve a large academic community besides functioning as a Regional Resource

Center. Thus, Penn State, in addition to its large number of loans also borrows more than the others.

4. Academic Libraries

Academic libraries in the Commonwealth are highly diversified and it is difficult to generalize about them. They include libraries of large universities and small colleges, each with a personality and philosophy of its own. Collections of these institutions tend to have major subject strengths in their areas of interest. Academic libraries have a lively interest in resource sharing and interlibrary loan. This is illustrated by the many consortia which have been formed by academic libraries or with academic libraries in the majority.

The diversity in the academic library community is reflected by the classification by the Pennsylvania Department of Education in its publication "Our Colleges and Universities Today" (33). We have used the same classification which points to their differences in governance and support structure. The major types of institutions thus considered are: a) State owned institutions, b) State-Related Commonwealth Universities (except Penn State, which is individually considered as a Regional Resource Center), c) Community Colleges, d) Private State aided institutions, e) Private Colleges and Universities, f) Theological Seminaries, and g) Junior Colleges. We have not included the libraries of proprietary schools.

Perhaps as a result of their source of funding, the state-owned institutions and the community colleges tend to be more involved with their local communities. For example, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, California State College and Clarion State College will lend to local residents who are not otherwise connected with the campus, as will Butler and Westmoreland Co. Community Colleges. This is also true of some of the campuses of Penn State. Private colleges have various policies, but frequently they too attempt to serve the residents of their communities.

The broad geographical scattering of the state colleges does not inhibit their mutual cooperation and the Council of Pennsylvania State College and University Library Directors has encouraged resource sharing among these libraries. Their access to the statewide telephone network is an advantage not shared by other groups, except for the state-related universities.

The theological seminaries, with their specialized collections, can serve as a useful resource for other libraries while, on the other hand, they need to borrow material from other, more general libraries. They, too, recognize this and many have joined resource sharing consortia in order to facilitate these activities.

5. Special Libraries

It is even more difficult to characterize special libraries by some sort of "average" behavior than the diverse academic community.

For example, the perception that most special libraries are small should not lead one to conclude that they all are. One need mention only the large collections in such libraries as those of the Franklin Institute, the Library Company of Philadelphia, and the Historical Society of Philadelphia. The previously noted difference (p. 7) between the lending-borrowing patterns of the libraries of the not-profit vs. the for-profit institutions would seem to imply that the for-profits are the ones which need and use many of the searching tools while non-profits, being net lenders, are less interested in these.

Many special librarians seemed anxious to share their collections as a form of reimbursement for the services of other libraries even though some felt that their collections were too specialized to interest others. One librarian felt that she considered her library as a "user" of other libraries. However, the problems of providing bibliographic access to the special library collections are even more acute than with some others. For example, most special libraries do not subscribe to OCLC's on-line services for good economic reasons. Their collections, moreover, are not usually found in any Union Catalogs. Access to such collections, then, becomes a major problem.

6. Medical Libraries

We consider medical libraries apart from other special libraries because they participate in a well-structured hierarchical network which gives them access to large medical collections from the National Library of Medicine down to local hospitals and hospital library consortia. Medical library services are provided to all qualified users in Pennsylvania through the Mid-Eastern Regional Medical Library Service (MERMLS). It is important to note the restriction to "qualified" users: i.e. health science personnel, including researchers, practitioners, educators and students. This restriction of MERMLS services is legally necessary--but bibliographic access services through Union Lists are not necessarily so circumscribed. MERMLS is based at the College of Physicians of Philadelphia, with regional centers at the Falk Medical Library of the University of Pittsburgh and the Hershey Medical Center of Pennsylvania State University. These latter facilities are also large net lenders but they both have as primary clientele their own health science professionals and students for whom they also borrow materials.

As we noted previously, most of the transactions in this group consist of photocopies of journal articles. MERMLS uses a system of quota stamps issued to each library in proportion to the number of potential users located at the facility. Stamps are affixed to each request and the lender may subsequently re-use the stamps for his own borrowing.

The Medical Library System is subsidized by grants from the National Library of Medicine (NLM). Up to now, NLM has reimbursed the full cost of ILL, estimated to be four dollars per request. Beginning in 1979, MERMLS is adopting a cost sharing basis and payment of one dollar per request will be expected of each user. NLM will still continue to pay

the other three dollars, so that this ILL system remains atypical in the subsidy it enjoys.

B. Bibliographic Access Through Library Cooperative Organizations

The 1976 Inventory of Pennsylvania Library Cooperative Organizations (16) lists some 26 cooperative organizations in addition to the 27 District Library Centers and the Interlibrary Delivery Service. These organizations vary from highly structured formal consortia such as PALINET/ULC to informal arrangements of groups which have simply agreed to interloan films. Functions of these cooperatives vary, but we are interested in the methods by which they provide bibliographic access to their membership and others.

1. Single Type Cooperatives

(a) Film Cooperatives

Of the film cooperatives, the Western Pennsylvania Public Library 16 mm Film Cooperative is the only one which reports having published a joint film catalog although the Lancaster-York-Conococheague Film Consortium reports one in process. Both of these consortia are limited purpose, informal organizations each consisting of a few District Library Center members. Bibliographic access to films is thus limited. Aside from the two consortia mentioned above, each DLC which possesses a collection must be queried separately.

(b) Academic Cooperatives

1. COPSCAULD (The Council of Pennsylvania State College and University Library Directors)

COPSCAULD has a Union List of Serials and a list of microforms which are available in the State College and University libraries. An updated newspaper directory is to be published soon. All COPSCAULD lists also include the State Library. All of the members participate in the OCLC System.

2. ACLCP (Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania)

This consortium consists of a group of 16 Central Pennsylvania academic libraries in addition to the State Library. It has published a Union List of Serials and has also prepared a Union List of Newspapers. All use OCLC and thus have at least their current acquisitions on-line.

3. CPC (Central Pennsylvania Consortium)

This is a group of four colleges (Dickinson, Franklin & Marshall, Wilson and Gettysburg) which has been formed for mutual cooperation to provide various services. All of the members are also members of other consortia and thus they publish no union list or union catalog. However, they have entered retrospective holdings into the OCLC data base. In

addition, ULC microfilm (housed at Dickinson College) is shared by the four colleges.

4. WEBNET (Western Pennsylvania Buhl Network)

This is an experimental resource sharing network of six academic libraries in Western Pennsylvania. Only books and monographs are being processed with the aid of a minicomputer at the University of Pittsburgh. WEBNET is an attempt to demonstrate a resource sharing network on a regional scale which could eventually interface with national networks. It is designed to provide on-line bibliographic access, reference, ILL, cataloging and circulation functions in conjunction with other networks to which the libraries belong. In addition, there are patron terminals at all six member libraries to access the data bases of these libraries.

5. LVAIC (Lehigh Valley Association of Independent College Libraries)

This resource sharing network of six small colleges in Eastern Pennsylvania facilitates the ILL function by producing union lists of serials and microforms which are also available to outside institutions. There is no union catalog. All six colleges are on-line with OCLC and can use it for locations. In addition, the ULC microfilm is available at Lehigh University. Individual libraries may perform their own free searches or use Lehigh's search service for a fee.

6. TCLC (Tri-State College Library Cooperative)

TCLC is an academic library cooperative that was formed in 1967. Since that time the membership number has varied from the original 12 to the current 28.

During the summer of 1976, a union listing of member's monographic holdings in the form of a card file was begun. At that time, thirteen libraries began sending TCLC the cards of their current acquisitions. Five of these were not included in the Union Library Catalogue of Pennsylvania (ULC).

As member libraries joined OCLC they stopped sending cards of their acquisitions to TCLC. At present, four colleges are still sending TCLC their cards.

TCLC has also published a Union List of Serials, containing the periodical holdings of 27 members.

(c) Health Science Cooperatives

In this section we consider the various health science cooperatives

which have developed in local areas with the blessing and encouragement of MERMLS. These include:

1. Central Pennsylvania Health Sciences Library Association
2. Erie Area Health Information Library Cooperative
3. HILNNEP(Health Information Library Network of Northeastern Pennsylvania)
4. Cooperating Hospital Libraries of the Lehigh Valley Area
5. Pittsburgh-East Hospital Library Cooperative
6. Somerset-Bedford Medical Library Consortium
7. Consortium for Health Information and Library Resources
8. Southeast Pittsburgh Consortium
9. Northwest Allegheny Hospital Library Consortium
10. Laurel Highlands Health Sciences Library Consortium

Of these consortia, Central Pennsylvania, HILNNEP, Lehigh Valley, Somerset-Bedford, and the Consortium for Health Information and Library Resources have produced union lists of serials of their members' holdings. The only Union Catalog of monographs among these is the one developed by the Lehigh Valley group.

In addition to the union lists of serials produced by these consortia, another Union List of Serials with the holdings of state institutions has been made available through the Norristown State Hospital Library. The VA Hospital libraries of District 5 (southwestern Pennsylvania and northwestern West Virginia) have produced a union list of serials, as have the members of the Pittsburgh Chapter of the Medical Library Association.

MERMLS also has a list of currently received journal titles of all its participating libraries. The medical fraternity thus has access to journals state-wide and region-wide through MERMLS, and has formed local consortia to share more usual journals. MERMLS, for example, restricts its distribution of 35 commonly held medical journals with the expectation that these will be available locally.

Access via monograph lists among the medical libraries is much less common. Cataloging of acquisitions of 48 state hospital and institution libraries is performed on OCLC at the State Library, which also furnishes location service to these libraries.

2. Multitype Cooperatives

The multitype cooperative organizations in Pennsylvania include, besides PALINET and PRLC, a number of smaller consortia which provide regional services:

(a) NEPBC (Northeastern Pennsylvania Bibliographic Center)

With its headquarters at King's College, Wilkes-Barre, this consortium has twelve members including seven academic libraries, four public libraries (including two District Library Centers) and one hospital library.

The Union Catalog of the Bibliographic Center contains main entries for about 550,000 titles. The Center also has the ULC microfilm and an OCLC terminal available for further searches. ILL requests are handled for members and location service is also available for non-members.

The Bibliographic Center also publishes a Union List of U.S. Government Documents currently received by three members which are selective governmental depositories. HILNNEP is a sub-group of NEPSC and maintains its own Union Catalog and Union List of Serials for its member libraries.

About 55 percent of the 3,500 requests sent annually to the Center are satisfied locally while the others are searched on OCLC and ULC microfilm. Location requests are honored from any library. At present non-members are not charged.

(b) NICOP (Northwest Interlibrary Cooperative of Pennsylvania)

This informal organization is comprised predominantly of academic libraries in Northwestern Pennsylvania, but there are also three Public libraries (including one District Library Center). Membership is open to other types of libraries as well. The organization produces no union catalog or union list of serials.

(c) SLC (Susquehanna Library Cooperative)

This cooperative has a diverse membership consisting of twelve academic, public and hospital libraries and produces a Union List of Serials.

(d) PALINET and Union Library Catalog of Pennsylvania

PALINET/ULC is the largest multitype consortium in Pennsylvania. It includes members in New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland, in addition to its predominant membership in Eastern Pennsylvania. In addition to acting as a facilitator of OCLC use, this consortium provides bibliographic verification and location referral for monographs and serials (without specific holdings information) from the Union Library Catalogue, National Union Catalogs and other sources. The Union Library Catalogue of Pennsylvania (ULC) has 4 1/2 million entries with locations in over 200 libraries, 90 of which are still active. ULC stopped adding entries to the file in 1975 and the main file and a supplement from 1970 through December 1975 have been microfilmed. Microfilm copies of ULC have been distributed to the Regional Resource Center and have been purchased by several consortia and other libraries which are providing location services from this source.

Thirty-six libraries with holdings in ULC are now using OCLC for cataloging and thus their current holdings are available on OCLC, sixteen of them since before the end of 1975 and the others since then.

(e) PRLC (Pittsburgh Regional Library Center)

PRLC, with its membership in Western Pennsylvania, West Virginia and Maryland, is a facilitator of OCLC use and, in addition, provides a number of other services. It publishes the Western Pennsylvania Resources directory and operates a Clearinghouse for Interlibrary Loan to provide monographic locations. Provision of locations for serials is being planned. The Clearinghouse has microfilm catalogs of eight colleges and universities in Pennsylvania, including those of the University of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania State University, Carnegie-Mellon and Duquesne University. In addition it uses the card catalogs and other resources of the Carnegie Library of Pittsburgh, an OCLC terminal and the West Virginia Union Catalog on microfiche. The Clearinghouse has a number of book catalogs, the microfilm catalog of the Erie City & County Library and the microfilms of the Union Library Catalogue of Pennsylvania. Members of PRLC receive free location service on the ULC but beyond that must pay a small fee after a certain number of free searches for the other resources of the Clearinghouse. Non-members are charged a flat search fee. The services of the Clearinghouse are valuable but many of the catalogs are not updated, so that their utility as sources of current information decreases with time as items are withdrawn from the collections they represent. At the present time, however, they are sufficiently current to provide a valuable service.

PRLC has also published a Union List of Serials which is in the process of being updated on-line. The present list is in two volumes, one of which includes the holdings of the University of Pittsburgh, while the other includes holdings from 57 academic, special and public libraries in the Pittsburgh Region.

C. Bibliographic Access Via OCLC

As mentioned before, both PALINET and PRLC have as one of their principal functions the provision of services to facilitate the use of the services of OCLC. This on-line cataloging system as of the end of July, 1978 had more than 3 1/2 million entries with location holdings in libraries throughout the nation (34). In Pennsylvania, OCLC membership is well represented in all types of libraries, but is most heavily concentrated in the academic community, the District Library Centers and Regional Resource Centers (see Table XLIV). Medical and Special libraries of all types, which are usually small, rarely are users of OCLC. (17) Obviously, there is a break-even point in number of titles cataloged, below which OCLC becomes uneconomic. Of course, if some sort of subsidy or grant is provided, a much smaller collection can be serviced. However, in the long run, only those functions that can be maintained without grant money will be viable. (18)

Libraries with OCLC terminals can get location information through this data base. Our survey has indicated the extent to which OCLC is

used (see Tables XXIX-XXXIII). It is, of course, most useful for current material and for locating material in libraries which have put their catalogs on-line retrospectively.

D. Access to Non-Book Materials

1. Serials

It is in the field of access to serials that most librarians feel increasing demands for services. As on-line bibliographic retrieval services proliferate and increase their coverage, the demand for articles from serials indexed by those services increases since they do not generally supply the complete paper for which they provide abstracts and references. Although we have not directly studied the impact of these services, statements by librarians whom we have interviewed leave no doubt that they consider a Union List of Serials with as broad a coverage as possible to be a major access priority. At present, there is no on-line system which fully provides this service. OCLC currently provides information on titles held but detailed holdings are only now being developed by various large library systems and networks. There are large national projects such as CONSER which has developed standards for bibliographic control and is building a comprehensive international serials data base. The projected national periodical system is focused on delivery. In our current study, we are interested in access, but the development of the delivery system is certainly pertinent to the problem of access. The overall problem of interlibrary loan and resource sharing cannot be totally compartmentalized.

Access to serials cannot be discussed without mention of the impact of the new copyright law which went into effect on January 1, 1978. As we have seen, most periodical literature is delivered from one library to another by photocopy rather than by loans of entire volumes or issues of journals, a circumstance which requires careful consideration of the copyright law and the need for reimbursement of copyright owners. This applies especially to the large lenders, but even the smaller ones must comply with the requirements of the law. The total impact is not yet clear, but delivery systems are principally affected.

In the discussion of the various individual consortia, we have mentioned the many localized union lists of serials published. Some of these are specialized by type of library, such as the ones produced by HILNNEP and the Norristown State Hospital; others are regional and cover multi-types of libraries in specific areas such as those of PRLC and NEPBC. The large universities produce union lists of their library holdings, especially where multi-branch campuses are involved. However, there is no way in which a library in Pennsylvania, even a large one, can be made aware of the holdings of other libraries in the Commonwealth in any systematic manner.

Mention has been made of the national projects concerned with serials. The problems of bibliographic access have been addressed via the CONSER (Conversion of Serials) project which is producing an on-line data base

in standard MARC II format. CONSER started with the development of an automated serials data base using the resources of 14 large North American libraries with the computer facilities of OCLC.

The Council on Library Resources (CLR) managed the project for two years and a file with more than 180,000 titles has been built. At present, management of the project is continuing under OCLC. Emphasis on bibliographic quality of the data base continues. CONSER records on magnetic tape are being furnished by OCLC to the Library of Congress and the National Library of Canada for subsequent distribution.

The National Commission on Libraries and Information Science (NCLIS) appointed a Task Force on a National Periodicals System in November, 1975 which produced a report, published in April, 1977 (20) which recommended a three-level hierarchical system as follows (21):

"Level 1 - Local, State and Regional Library System
Responsible for meeting a substantial portion of routine needs for periodicals.

Level 2 - A comprehensive periodicals collection dedicated for lending and photocopy service to meet the majority of unfilled requests from Level 1. Initially, a single National Periodicals Center would be developed but experience and demand may warrant more than one.

Level 3 - Existing national libraries and unique collections to back up the first two levels."

This recommendation was accepted by NCLIS, which proceeded to explore the various possibilities for a National Periodicals Center. CLR was requested by the Library of Congress to prepare a technical development plan for the National Periodicals Center. The plan was completed in August, 1978, and the report which was published by CLR (22) details the proposals. As far as bibliographic access is concerned, the proposal states (23):

> "The NPC will develop and make available a finding tool to identify the titles and holdings to which NPC can provide access. The finding tool will be organized by key title and International Standard Serial Number (ISSN) and will include titles available from both the NPC collection and the referral system libraries."

Furthermore, one of the objectives of the NPC is to promote the development of local and regional resource sharing while functioning as a reliable back up for local and regional resources.

The NPC finding tool is proposed to be issued at least once a quarter in COM-produced microfiche. It is to contain two sections, the first

listing all records by ISSN and the second listing the records alphabetically and by key and variant title.

2. Other Non-Book Material

Access to non-book material such as films and A/V material is highly spotty at best. Film consortia produce their own Union Catalogs and thus provide access for their membership. However, our survey indicates that non-print material is at present involved in interlibrary loan only to a minor extent. We have not surveyed the school libraries, however, where borrowing of films and A/V material is possibly more widespread. Nevertheless, it does not seem that general bibliographic access to such material should be accorded as high a priority as that to books and serials.

Section IV - Recommendations for Improving Bibliographic Access

A. Introduction

At the outset of this study we listed some questions which needed to be answered (see page 1). The ILL survey and analysis has shown the type of materials being loaned and the extent to which existing services have helped to locate the desired materials. It is apparent that equal access to all collections has not been achieved and that improvement in location services and more efficient provision of holdings information are necessary conditions for the attainment of that goal. These improvements must be accomplished within reasonable fiscal and time constraints and the following recommendations are made in that spirit.

It should be remembered that improvements of bibliographic access, however beneficial to the borrowers, may increase the burden of the lenders. The more widely the latter's collections are known, the more they will be called upon to share them. The goal, then, must be to expand the system of bibliographic access so that as many libraries as possible are involved as lenders as well as borrowers.

B. Recommendations

1. Develop a coordinated plan to expand access to older bibliographic records within Pennsylvania, this plan to include:

   a) The encouragement, by the provision of appropriate incentives, of retrospective inputs into the OCLC data base by a greater number of libraries.

   b) The development of a state-wide, on-line Union List of Serials in accordance with national standards.

2. Provide appropriate incentives to encourage libraries to share their collections.

3. Encourage existing agencies that produce indexes to subject collections in Pennsylvania libraries to adopt compatible formats and terminologies, thus providing improved access, especially to collections such as those of the special libraries which are not otherwise accessible.

We appreciate that to adopt the foregoing recommendations will require a major commitment of funds over a period of years. Each of the recommendations will be discussed on its own merits to help establish the necessary priorities.

1. (a) The encouragement, by the provision of appropriate incentives, of retrospective input into the OCLC data base by a greater number of libraries.

The rationale for this recommendation stems from the fact that monographs are the predominant form of interlibrary loan, as our survey indicates, and that bibliographic access to monographs will be enhanced through retrospective entry of the holdings of libraries into the OCLC on-line data base.

This data base is, of course, a form of union catalog. Ideally, such a catalog should:

a) Have a broad coverage as to the numbers and types of libraries included as well as the time span of its publications.

b) Be capable of being readily and inexpensively updated.

c) Be available at a reasonable cost.

The first criterion is met by OCLC as far as the numbers and types of libraries are concerned, but the time span is limited by the relative recency of the development of OCLC, except for those libraries which have entered their holdings retrospectively.

Updating the on-line catalog, for those libraries using the OCLC system, goes on automatically as they catalog their acquisitions. The availability at "reasonable" cost depends on whether the library already has a terminal available and on the volume of use. Cost certainly is not "reasonable" for direct use by a small library. NELINET (25) has estimated costs of access in various modes, and at a rate of 25 requests per month for each of 12 members using an OCLC terminal cooperatively for interlibrary loan, they estimate a cost of $1.59 per request, without including personnel costs and overhead. This would provide an automated ILL system similar to the one which OCLC expects to implement in 1979. The charge to use the OCLC Interlibrary Loan Communications Subsystem for borrowing will be $.86 (net) to generate a request, which can be transmitted automatically to as many as five libraries.

Use of the OCLC terminal just for bibliographic access is less costly, especially if sufficient time is available on an existing terminal so that there is no interference with the cataloging function and no need to acquire an additional terminal exclusively for ILL. The libraries using OCLC for bibliographic access are at present using their terminals in this shared mode.

We thus are confronted with two elements of cost if we are to consider expanded on-line bibliographic access through the OCLC system:

1. Augmenting the data base by including more retrospective holdings from more libraries.
2. Enhancing access to monographs for libraries which at present do not use the OCLC shared cataloging system.

To estimate the cost of augmenting the data base, we may consider the costs of some of the projects designed to input large retrospective catalogs into OCLC which have reported costs (or projected costs) and which are pertinent to our concerns. One of the early projects was carried out in Florida under the acronym COMCAT (26). A Union Catalog on-line with OCLC of 639,000 titles with 1,233,000 locations in 15 major Florida libraries was produced. In total, 1,400,000 records were converted to machine-readable form at a cost of 67¢ per record. Duplication of records here amounted to about 54%. In addition to the records available on-line, they are also

available in sets of microfiche costing twenty dollars to produce (27).

OCLC itself is involved in a project involving conversion to machine-readable form of catalog records for non-fiction books in major Ohio public libraries (28). This project, funded by a $550,000 grant, began in June, 1976 and is continuing; thus far 1,336,000 records have been processed (29). It is estimated that more than 1,500,000 records will have been processed by the time the project is completed, indicating a processing cost of 37¢ per record.

Another study of catalog conversion to machine-readable form has been made by the University of California at Berkeley (30). The cost for brief main entry conversion was estimated to be $700,000 while full main entry conversion plus brief added entry conversion was estimated to cost $1,500,000 for a catalog containing 2,117,000 main entries and 1,265,000 added entries. The higher estimate then means that it would cost about .70 per main entry for the conversion. Estimates were in 1975 dollars.

These studies indicate the approximate magnitude of the costs for any conversion project designed to input the catalogs of any of the large libraries. Since these are essentially mass production projects, one can surmise that any program which involves piecemeal conversion of relatively lesser numbers of items would be based on somewhat different premises.

The University of California in a further study has projected the development of an on-line catalog for its entire system. Their system is too large to be on-line to OCLC which cannot absorb the 600 terminals needed for the University of California on-line catalog. U.C. proposes to use OCLC for input, with different terminals for data base usage (31). Total costs for the on-line catalog are projected to be about $7,500,000 over the ten year period with about $750,000 per year costs for on-going maintenance. Savings effected at Berkeley alone are estimated to be $375,000 per year. It is claimed that the on-line system should save about twice as much as it costs (31). Figures quoted do not seem to have been adjusted for inflation.

In one example of the conversion of library retrospective cataloging records, the experience at SUNY Geneseo is indicative of possible costs in academic libraries where student help is available (36). The project, funded by a $4,000 grant, resulted in the insertion of 24,811 catalog records into the OCLC data base during the project period, which was the summer of 1978. In this time period, fifteen student operators worked for a total of about 1300 hours. The holdings records inserted were those which were found in the OCLC data base. Those which were not found (about 10%), were verified in other sources and are to be inserted into the data base later.

In another instance where a shelf-list of about 45,000 titles was input in a small college library, student help was used to a great extent. Unfortunately, there was no record kept of time and costs, but the entire project took about a year and a half with people working as they had time and as the terminal was available.

To estimate costs of retrospective conversion for the DLC's, it is necessary to determine the number of titles to be converted. This depends both on the total number of unconverted titles and the proportion of these which should be processed.

We note that, according to our survey (Table XVII), 54 percent of the items lent by the DLC's date from 1972 or later and more than 80 percent date no further back than 1960. We have estimated the total number of unconverted titles held by the DLC's by reference to their statistics. As of the end of 1976, the DLC's held about 4,320,000 volumes. They have been adding about 300,000 volumes a year and withdrawing about half that number. Since mid-1975 when the DLC's started to use OCLC, they have acquired about 1,000,000 volumes or about 500,000 titles, assuming two volumes per title. Their collections at the end of 1978 should be about 4,600,000 volumes or 2,300,000 titles, of which 500,000 titles were cataloged using OCLC and are thus entered into the on-line catalog.

If we assume that the actual holdings of the DLC's are similar in age distribution to the lending pattern in our survey, we can estimate the number of titles which should be converted for a given holding rate.

For example, 60 percent of the items lent by the DLC's date from 1970 or later. Of the total holdings of 2,300,000 titles, we then assume that 1,400,000 - 60 percent - date from 1970 also. Of these, 500,000 were entered on the on-line catalog and thus 900,000 remain to be converted. Therefore, with conversion of 900,000 titles we can expect that 60 percent of the items lent by the DLC's will be on-line, consisting of 1970 imprints and later. Similarly, post-1960 imprints will be involved more than 80 percent of the time, requiring retrospective entry of 1,300,000 items.

Since the DLC's do not have ready access to each other's collections except thru OCLC, we strongly recommend that their holdings be converted retrospectively, back to the 1970 imprints for 60 percent of their holdings or 1960 for 80 percent.

The cost of a retrospective conversion should be comparable to that of the Ohio project cited above. (P. 29) Differences will occur primarily because of the fact that the Pennsylvania records are distributed over 25 District Library Centers (excluding Philadelphia and Pittsburgh) while in Ohio only six very large libraries have been involved. Also, any inflationary effects must also be factored in. Consequently, we estimate that the job can be done for about $500,000 for conversion of 1,000,000 titles in all the DLC's. The total number of titles to be processed and the rate at which the work will be done are a function of the funds available and the priorities assigned, but the task should not be neglected.

The academic libraries present a situation different in its details from that of the DLC's. For example, holdings of the State College and University libraries amounted to 3,780,000 volumes as of the end of 1976. Retrospective conversion of their holdings would require a larger overall effort than that for the DLC's. However, in view of the need for cooperation among the State Colleges, as book budgets shrink, conversion would be desirable if they could be funded for this purpose. With student help the

costs can be held down. As Table XXIII shows, the State Colleges now lend about one-fourth of their total interlibrary loans to public libraries. As the proportion of holdings on-line increases, cooperation between the public libraries and the State Colleges should increase.

Besides this, many private academic libraries are already engaged in conversion. Seventeen private Pennsylvania colleges in the PALINET network report that they are presently engaged in conversion projects. These will take them an average of five years to complete if they each convert about 20,000 titles per year as planned. With some funding, the time required can be significantly decreased to the benefit of all. Not only that, but the lending burden will be distributed more equitably if the rate at which each of these libraries convert could be equalized. In that way, libraries which happen to be in a position to process their collections more rapidly than others will not be deterred from doing so for fear of a larger interlibrary lending load. It is necessary to coordinate the distribution of the available funding to ensure optimum benefits.

Access to monographs for libraries which at present do not use the OCLC shared cataloging system could be enhanced by bringing them into that system. There are a number of non-DLC public libraries in the Commonwealth which are larger than some DLC's and which could benefit from access to the OCLC system. In addition, more than one-half of the private colleges and universities do not use the OCLC system. Massive funding for all these non-participants is not being suggested here, but selectively helping a number of those for which the cost-benefit ratio (however estimated) is most favorable would be desirable.

At present, the non-participants in the OCLC system use whatever Union Catalogs they have available or cooperate in support of a clearing-house or bibliographic center, which has access to local Union Catalogs as well as to the on-line catalog of OCLC. Costs at these clearinghouses are rising and their usage is falling as they attempt to recover costs and as many of their members acquire their own searching tools. In the short term, the clearinghouses need to be assisted to maintain their present services. One way of doing this is to encourage local cooperation by assisting those libraries which are not members of clearinghouses to join and use them. In the long term, clearinghouses and bibliographic centers need to be maintained by their members who have to determine the level of service they require and the costs they are willing to bear.

1. (b) The development of a state-wide, on-line Union List of Serials in accordance with national standards.

Developing a state-wide, Union List of Serials is no less important than increasing the number of libraries with retrospective holdings entered into OCLC.

One of the first questions many librarians asked when approached about bibliographic access was: "When are we going to have a Union List of Serials?" Such lists as we have seen, abound throughout the Commonwealth.

They vary in form, in comprehensiveness and in the constituencies they are designed to serve. No library can be expected to have them all. Moreover, as the computerized data bases proliferate and more people gain access to journal references, the demand for copies of the articles referred to increases and the elusiveness of holdings information becomes more apparent.

Production of a state-wide Union List and keeping it up-to-date would provide every user with the location information needed to request this type of material.

As noted above, production of the Union List is only one aspect of the problem; keeping it current is also necessary. The ideal, of course, is an on-line list which is kept up-to-date by direct entry of new data into the data base. Since many libraries do not have terminals, and cannot be expected to have them, we must make provision for them to access the Union List some other way. We propose that the on-line list be published in Computer-Output-Microfiche (COM) format.

The foregoing proposal is unrealistic unless we outline some method of implementation with estimated cost figures. It is also desirable that any implementation method be compatible with the projected National Serials System (20, 22). Thus, the state-wide Union List should provide access to at least the recommended Level I of the proposed system - "Local, state and regional library systems responsible for meeting a substantial portion of routine needs for periodicals" (20). It was estimated that 2,000 titles will supply approximately 50 percent of the expected total annual demand for currently published titles and that 8,000 more titles are required to meet the next 40 percent of total demand. Thus, from the point of view of bibliographic access, 90 percent of the demand for current titles could be found in a Union List of the 10,000 most heavily used titles. In addition, of course, there is a large number of deceased titles which have to be considered.

The cost of developing a Union List produced on-line may be estimated by a consideration of the up-dating project of the 1973 Pittsburgh Union List of Serials. This list consists of holdings statements for 23,000 titles. Assuming that bibliographic entry is satisfactory, a trained inputter can do about 1,000 holdings statements per month (assuming 50 per day for 20 days). The 1973 list averaged 2.6 holdings per title. If holdings for 5,000 titles are input, with 3 per title, then 15 man-months would be required. With an inputter's salary at about $1,000 per month (including fringe benefits), this would entail a cost of approximately $1.00 per holdings statement. This, of course, does not include any cataloging or other bibliographic work which may be necessary. However, it does indicate that a Union List is feasible at a reasonable cost. A requirement for the preparation of such a Union List is the existence of one or more large Union Lists which can be augmented and updated. Such lists, of course, do exist in the large academic centers of the Commonwealth. Once such a list is produced, up-dating can be accomplished on a continuous basis by a center designated and funded to perform this function.

The Union List could be available on-line on a current basis to all libraries which have the terminal and communications facilities. Those libraries which do not have such terminals would have to avail themselves of some other form of access. The recommendation here is that this should be in COM. Cost of production of computer output microfiche depends on such variables as the reduction ratio and type of film. As an example, a single microfiche with the contents of 100 pages of a hard-copy list at a reduction ratio of 48X can be produced for about thirteen cents (35). Thus, the equivalent of a 1,000 page volume would cost about $1.30. The only other cost to the library would be a one-time purchase of a reader, at the cost of about $200.00 for a microfiche reader or about $700.00 for a microfilm reader. The cost estimate for production and dissemination or microforms indicates that even very small libraries could use the Union Lists in this form.

Most usefully, this Union List should include the same types of periodicals as those projected for the National Periodicals Center (22, p. 46). The Center, however, does not plan to include clinical medicine in its initial effort. In view of the unavailibility of the MERMLS service to the general population, the Pennsylvania Union List should include clinical medicine as much as possible.

To be most useful, the journals should be those which are indexed or abstracted in a number of sources. These should include not only the technical abstract journals such as Chemical Abstracts, but also (and especially) the indexes of more popular magazines such as Magazine Index. Magazines of very large circulation which should be available almost everywhere should be excluded, such as the fifty-two magazines in the United States with a circulation of one million or more.

The suggested procedure, as previously indicated, is to start with one existing Union List which is being currently maintained in machine-readable form. There are a number of such at the large academic centers of the Commonwealth from whom proposals should be requested.

Libraries whose input would be useful for such a list include not only the academic libraries, but all of the large public libraries, including the District Library Centers. The special libraries of all types should also be included to the extent they are willing to participate. It is important, moreover, to maintain and update this list regularly.

2. Provide appropriate incentives to encourage libraries to share their collections.

The provision of funding to develop access tools is an integral part of the previous recommendations. However, we must go one step further. As the access tools improve, more libraries will be called upon to lend. Unfortunately, even though in the long run resource sharing will result in economies, the present realities of funding are such that many libraries are reluctant to expand their interlibrary lending. Eventually, when a sufficient number of libraries have their collections accessible, load

leveling may occur. Nevertheless, in the hierarchical system which refers requests from public libraries to District Library Centers to Regional Resource Centers, it is inevitable that the upper levels of the hierarchy will be net lenders. The State Library Code recognizes this and provides some funding to District Library Centers and Regional Resource Centers, but there is no provision for funding any other type of library.

Information seekers who are not affiliated with any institution should have their needs satisfied through their public libraries. Insofar as these libraries need to call upon other types of libraries for interlibrary loans, the latter should be compensated either monetarily or by some quid pro quo arrangement.

3. Encourage existing agencies that produce indexes to subject collections in Pennsylvania libraries to adopt compatible formats and terminologies, thus providing improved access, especially to collections such as those of special libraries which are not otherwise accessible.

Ideally, this suggestion could lead to the production of a comprehensive subject collections index. A project such as this, although of lower priority than the previously recommended projects, would help in the location of elusive items. Individual items often have to be tracked down by some sort of detective work and even then their existence may only be discovered serendipitously. In a library, this is often the result of browsing in an area of subject interest. The analogy with interlibrary loan is the sending of a request for a certain item to a source which is "likely" to have the item. As we have seen, (Table XXVIII), this procedure is admitted to about 8 percent of the time, but one wonders how often the various borrowers "knew" that a particular library possessed an item, which in fact it did not have.

In any event, whether a borrower is embarked on a subject search or whether he is considering asking a "likely" library for a specific item, if he has general knowledge of where particular subject collections are to be found, the likelihood of success should be markedly increased. It should be emphasized that the general information which is presented by a subject collections index should not be substituted for location identification.

In Pennsylvania, there are a number of directories which help the librarian to conduct subject searches, including the Directory of Pennsylvania Library Resources (24), the Directory of Libraries and Information Sources in the Philadelphia Area (37), the Directory of Special Libraries in Pittsburgh and Vicinity (38), and Western Pennsylvania Resources (39).

The Directory of Pennsylvania Library Resources has entries for 226 Academic Libraries, 224 Special libraries, and 27 large public libraries. The subjects are indexed by Library of Congress subject headings, where applicable. One major problem with this Directory, as with all such compendia, is that it becomes less valuable with time. This one is more than five years old, which makes some of the information suspect, if not

obsolete. In addition, for the purposes of a finding tool, much of the information is not necessary and is redundant with similar information to be found in the Bowker "American Library Directory", which is now to be updated annually.

Former editions of the Bowker directory had subject indexes. For some time now, these have been omitted from the directory and essentially published separately as Lee Ash's "Subject Collections", which is currently in its fourth edition. It is a subject collection index of this type which would be valuable as a finding-tool.

Production of a compendium of subject collections would be considerably less expensive than a library directory update. The survey questionnaire could be much less complicated and focus on subject strengths, rather than such matters as personnel or finance. Information on the latter is available elsewhere if needed.

The directory, however, would need some additional information such as lending policy of the library and whether it is still continuing to collect in the subject. Criteria for inclusion of a collection should primarily consist of uniqueness and coverage of the particular field. Size of such special collections is of lesser importance, but the index should indicate the size in specific terms rather than in such statements as "extensive" or "large".

Coverage of the subject collections should be extended to as many libraries in the Commonwealth as can be identified. One beginning can be the more than 730 libraries in Pennsylvania which engaged in inter-library loan transactions with our sample group of libraries. Additionally, the public libraries listed in the Pennsylvania Public Libraries directory and libraries listed in the directories of the Philadelphia and Pittsburgh Special Libraries Association should be included. It is problematical whether all school libraries should be included, but it may be desirable to question appropriate officials of the Pennsylvania Department of Education about those schools which have special missions and thus are likely to have unusual items in their library collections.

By encouraging SLA and PRLC to establish a common format and to expand their coverage for their respective parts of the state, the cost of production of the compendium can be kept to a minimum. The watchword, as it is with the other recommendations, is cooperation.

REFERENCES

1) 1976-1981 Pennsylvania Library Development Plan, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania Dept. of Education, 1977.

2) See, for example, Illinois Libraries, Vol. 60, No. 4, April, 1978.

3) Meadow, Charles T., et. al., A Plan for Library Cooperation in Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Drexel University, 1976, 47 pp.

4) Ibid., p. 6.

5) 1976-1981 Pennsylvania Library Development Plan, p. 38.

6) Blasingame, Ralph, Feasibility of Cooperation for Exchange of Resources Among Academic and Special Libraries in Pennsylvania, Pennsylvania State Library, Monograph No. 5, 1967, 27 pp.

7) Cost and Funding Studies of the Proposed Western Interstate Bibliographic Network, Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, P.O. Drawer P, Boulder, CO, 80302, Nov., 1976.

8) Demonstration and Evaluation of the Effects of Incentive on Resource Sharing Using a Computerized Library Communication System, Final Report, Sept. 1, 1976 - Aug. 30, 1977, NELINET, New England Board of Higher Education, 40 Grove St., Wellesley, MA 02181.

9) Wilcox, Alice E. and Nancy H. Marshall, "MINITEX and WILS: Responses to Access Needs," RQ, Vol. 13, Summer, 1974, pp. 299-307.

10) Effective Access to the Periodical Literature: A National Program, Prepared by Task Force on a Network Periodical System, NCLIS, April 1, 1977, p. 25.

11) McGrath, William E. and Sam Dyson, "Regional Interlibrary Loan: An Old Idea, A New Tool and a New Dimension," RQ, 13:293-8, Summer, 1974.

12) de John, William and Bridget Lamont, Illinois Libraries, Vol. 57, June '75.

13) Jones, Adrian, ed., Illinois Libraries, Vol. 60, April, 1978.

14) Brown, Maryann Kevin and Anita L. McHugh, Survey of Costs in Technical Processing and Interlibrary Loan - Summary, Western Interstate Library Coordinating Organization, Boulder, Colorado, December, 1976.

REFERENCES (CONT.)

15) 1976 Pennsylvania Public Library Statistics, Pennsylvania Department of Education, 1978.

16) 1976 Inventory of Pennsylvania Library Cooperative Organizations, Bureau of Library Development, State Library of Pennsylvania, 1977.

17) OCLC Participating Libraries arranged by Network and Institution, 1978- July 20, Columbus, Ohio, OCLC, Inc.

18) Williams, James G. and Roger Flynn, "Network Topology: Functions of Existing Networks", Pittsburgh Conference on Structure-and Governance of Networks, Pittsburgh, PA 1978, p. 17.

19) LC Information Bulletin, Aug. 18, 1978, pp. 486-7.

20) National Commission on Libraries and Information Science Task Force on a National Periodicals System, "Effective Access to the Periodical Literature: A National Program", Washington, NCLIS, 1977, 92 pp.

21) Ibid., p. 1.

22) Council on Library Resources "A National Periodicals Center: Technical Development Plan", Council on Library Resources, Inc., 1978, 255 pp.

23) Ibid., P. XI.

24) Directory of Pennsylvania Library Resources: A Guide to the Resources and Services of Academic, Special and Large Public Libraries", Bureau of Library Development, State Library of Pennsylvania, 1973.

25) New England Library Information Network "Implementation of a Computerized Interlibrary System to Provide Market Value Information For Resource Sharing to a Multi-Type Regional Library Network", First Quarterly Report, Sept. 1, 1977 to November 30, 1977, Wellesley, Mass., New England Board of Higher Education.

26) Orlando Public Library, "Florida COMCAT: A Report or Florida's Union Catalog Project", State Library of Florida, 1976.

27) Ibid., p. 11.

28) COLC, Retrospective Conversion Project, State Library of Ohio, Project No. I-16-T-75.

29) Thompson M. LIttle, Assoc. Dir. OCLC, Private Communication, Oct. 11, 1978.

REFERENCES (CONT.)

30) Thompson, Donald, et. al. "A Study of the Conversion of the University of California at Berkeley Library Catalog to Machine Readable Form, with Options and Cost Estimates", General Library, University of California, Berkeley, 19 Sept. 1975.

31) "The University of California Libraries: A Plan for Development, 1978-1988", Office of the Executive Director University-wide library Planning, University of California, Berkeley, p. 73.

32) Shoffner, Ralph M., "Computer Based Circulation Control Systems: A State of the Art Report", Paper presented at 1978 Army Library Institute, 22-36, May 1978 at El Paso, Texas.

33) Pennsylvania Department of Education, Division of Educational Statistics, Our Colleges and Universities Today, "Library Resources, Staff and Operating Expenditures at Pennsylvania Institutions of Higher Education, 1975-76", Vol. XIV, No. 4, 1977.

34) OCLC, Inc., Annual Report, 1977-78. OCLC, Inc. 1125 Kinnear Road, Columbus, Ohio 43312.

35) Cox, Carolyn M. and Bonnie Juergens, "Microform Catalogs: A Viable Alternative for Texas Libraries", Amigos Bibliographic Council, Dallas, Texas, November, 1977.

36) SONAC Forum, SUNY/OCLC Network Advisory Committee, October, 1978, p. 7.

37) Directory of Libraries and Information Sources in the Philadelphia Area, 14th Edition, Philadelphia Chapter, Special Libraries Association, 1977.

38) Directory of Special Libraries in Pittsburgh and Vicinity, 9th Edition, Pittsburgh Chapter, Special Libraries Association, 1977.

39) Western Pennsylvania Resources, 2nd Edition, Pittsburgh Regional Library Center, 1978.

APPENDIX I

TABLES

Table I

Replies to the Bibliographic Access Study Survey by Library Category

Type of Library	No. Queried	No. Replying	Percent Replying
Regional Resource Center	4	3	75
District Library Center	25	24	96
Other Public Libraries	93	62	67
Total Public Libraries	122	89	73
State Colleges and University	14	14	100
Other Colleges and Universities	77	62	81
Community Colleges	14	11	79
Theological Seminaries	12	6	50
Junior Colleges	7	2	28
Specialized Schools	8	5	63
Total Academic	132	100	76
Hospital and Medical	32	24	75
Institutional	18	10	56
Total Medical	50	34	68
Special -- Law	4	3	75
Government	10	5	50
Other Non-Profit	15	7	47
Profit	42	16	38
Total Special	71	31	44
Grand Total	375	254	68

	Lending	Borrowing
Total Number of Forms Sent Out:	10,000	13,000
Total Number of Forms Returned:	6,800	8,200
Percent Returned:	68	63

Total Holdings Reported By Libraries Returning Forms: 34,000,000 volumes

TABLE II

WEIGHTING FACTORS FOR LIBRARY DATA

Library	B	L	Library	B	L
State Lib.	1	10	Albright	9.7	1
Penn State	5	15	Allegheny	2.3	1
Carnegie	1	10	Allentown St. Fran.	2	1
Aliquippa	6	3	Beaver	3	3
Allentown	1	3	Cedar Crest	2.9	3.7
Altoona	1	3.3	Dickinson	1.8	1.2
Bellefonte	2.2	1	Eastern	1.7	1
Bethlehem	1.4	1.9	F & M	1.9	1.6
Clarion	1.4	1	Gettysburg	2.4	1.9
Doylestown	2.6	1	Juniata	4.5	1.5
Erie	2.2	3.7	King's	1.7	5.1
Lancaster	3.2	1	Lafayette	1.3	1.9
Norristown	3.7	33	Marywood	1	2.1
Pottsville	3.1	1.8	Moravian	5	1
Reading	1	1.4	Muhlenberg	1.4	1
Scranton	1.3	2.2	Robert Morris	1	3.9
Warren	1	4.3	Wilkes	1.6	1.5
Washington	2	2.5	Wilson	1	2.4
West Chester	1.4	3.3	Albert Einstein	5.4	2.4
Wilkes-Barre	1	1.7	Allentown Hosp.	1.8	3.0
Williamsport	2.3	2.6	Coll. of Phys.	1	79
York	1.2	20	Inst. Cancer Res.	4	1
State College	4	4	Falk Medical	2.9	14
Tredyffrin	1.7	1.5	Hershey Medical Ctr.	6	37
Lewistown	2.2	1	Williamsport Hosp.	3.5	2
Lower Merion	2.3	1.4	USVA, Phila.	4.5	1
Oil City	1	1.5	USVA, Wilkes-Barre	1.4	2.4
Cal. S. C.	1	1.5	Wyeth	10	1
Millersville S.C.	1.6	2.4	Betz	5	1
Slippery Rock	1.6	1.9	Rohm & Haas	2.4	1
West Chester	1.8	1	U.S. Army War Coll.	2.7	19
U. of Pittsburgh	1	1.9	E. Pa. Psych. Inst.	10	2.9
Bryn Mawr	1	1.5	Somerset S. Hosp.	5.8	1
U. of Penn	1.9	7.3	Norristown S. Hosp.	1.4	1.8
CMU	1	2.3			
Duquesne	1	2			
Lehigh	2.4	16			
Swarthmore	1	1.2			
Villanova	1	1.2			
WPIC	2.8	2.9			
Hahnemann	5	11			
Med. Coll. Pa.	4	11			
Pa. Coll. Pod. Med.	3	1			
Thomas Jefferson U.	2.5	6.9			
Acad. New Church	1	1.5			

Table III

Total Lending and Borrowing for Most Recent Full Year

Type of Library	No. of Libraries	No. of items Loaned (L)	No. items Borrowed (B)	L-B	L+B	$\frac{L}{L+B}$ x100
REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER	4	55937	7933	48004	65870	88
(a) CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH.		13120	606	12514	13726	96
(b) FREE LIB. OF PHILA.(1)		10248	666	9582	10914	94
(c) PENN STATE UNIV. LIB.		17389	5672	11717	23061	75
(d) STATE LIB.		15180	989	14191	16169	94
DISTRICT LIB. CENTERS	25	92956	53530	39426	146486	63
PUBLIC LIBRARIES	61	9781	33922	-24141	43703	22
STATE OWNED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY	14	9738	9200	538	18938	51
STATE RELATED UNIVERSITIES (2)	2	6221	2867	3354	9088	68
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	10	893	1090	-197	1983	45
PRIVATE, STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	2	17728	6098	11630	23826	74
PRIVATE COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES	54	19711	31578	-11867	51289	38
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	4	522	167	355	689	76
PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES	2	21	72	-51	93	23
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	3	50	135	-85	185	27
LAW LIBRARIES	2	48	135	-87	183	26
MEDICAL LIBRARIES (3)	21	41237	21774	19463	63011	65
INSTITUTIONAL	8	4295	4270	25	8565	50
GOVERNMENT	4	1119	535	584	1654	68
SPECIAL (NON-PROFIT)	6	13359	4893	8466	18252	73
SPECIAL (PROFIT)	9	347	8482	-8135	8829	4
TOTALS	231	273963	186681	87282	460644	59

(1) Data from 1976 Pennsylvania Library Statistics
(2) Not including Penn State University which is listed under RRC
(3) Not including College of Physicians which in its special capacity lent 95,000 items and borrowed none.

Table IV

Net Borrowing and Lending Among Types of Libraries

Type of Library	$\frac{L}{L+B}$ X100	No. of Net Lenders	No. of Net Borrowers	No. of Equalized Lenders
REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTER				
(a) CARNEGIE LIB. OF PITTSBURGH	96	1	0	0
(b) FREE LIB. OF PHILADELPHIA	94	1	0	0
(c) PENN STATE U. LIB.	75	1	0	0
(d) STATE LIB.	94	1	0	0
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	63	18	6	1
PUBLIC LIBRARY	22	2	57	2
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	51	4	6	4
STATE RELATED UNIVERSITIES	68	2	0	0
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	45	3	7	0
PRIVATE, STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	74	2	0	0
PRIVATE COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES	38	15	30	9
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	76	2	2	0
PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES	23	0	2	0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	27	1	2	0
LAW LIBRARIES	26	1	1	0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	65	5	12	4
INSTITUTIONAL	50	2	5	1
GOVERNMENT	68	2	1	1
SPECIAL (NON-PROFIT)	73	6	0	0
SPECIAL (PROFIT)	4	0	9	0
TOTALS	59	69	140	22

(1) Data from 1976 Pennsylvania Library Statistics
(2) Not including Penn State University
(3) Not including College of Physicians
(4) "Equalized Lenders" defined as those for which $\frac{L}{L+B}$ X100 = 50 $\pm$ 5

TABLE V

TOTAL ILL BORROWING AND LENDING TRANSACTIONS-
TURNAROUND TIMES

LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF TRANS.	BORROWING LAG 1	NO. OF TRANS.	BORROWING LAG 2	BORROWING LAG 3	NO. OF TRANS.	LENDING LAG
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	2496	4.6	1256	7.4	12.0	8101	2.5
PUBLIC LIBRARY	2090	1.4	879	7.1	8.2	1030	1.2
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	804	1.9	414	8.8	10.3	863	1.1
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	151	0.7	77	5.6	6.4	78	2.1
STATE RELATED UNIV.	153	4.8	38	12.0	15.6	266	2.7
PRIVATE COLLEGES	3626	1.6	2235	6.4	7.8	4740	1.1
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	420	4.6	300	6.2	9.7	1364	6.4
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	41	1.7	28	7.4	8.4	70	1.9
JUNIOR COLLEGES	7	0.1	6	5.0	5.2	3	1.3
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	13	1.4	3	3.3	3.7	16	3.9
LAW LIBRARIES	13	0.2	8	5.8	5.8	5	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	1253	1.5	1016	6.8	8.4	2254	1.3
INSTITUTIONAL	364	1.6	180	6.5	7.8	157	1.1
GOVERNMENT	61	0.8	51	5.7	6.4	208	4.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	11	3.9	7	13.6	16.8	76	1.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	431	3.1	279	10.5	13.3	16	0.8
STATE LIB.	65	3.1	25	7.9	11.1	1000	2.2
PENN STATE UNIV.	495	2.1	360	9.9	11.9	1335	4.2
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	47	1.2	28	12.6	13.6	990	0.0
TOTALS	12542	2.4	7190	7.2	9.4	22572	2.2

Borrowing LAG 1 = Mean number of Days from Patron Request to Borrowing Library Request.
Borrowing LAG 2 = Mean number of Days from Borrowing Library Request to Receipt of item.
Borrowing LAG 3 = Mean number of Days from Patron Request to Receipt of item.
Lending LAG = Mean number of Days from Receipt of Borrowing Request to sending of reply.

TABLE VI

IN-STATE ILL ACTIVITY

TYPE OF LIBRARY	IN-STATE BORROWING, %	IN-STATE LENDING, %
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTER	86.1	94.3
PUBLIC LIBRARY	98.3	99.1
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	84.1	94.6
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	84.7	87.8
STATE RELATED UNIVERSITIES	31.5	52.1
PRIVATE COLLEGES	90.5	87.1
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	81.6	54.3
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	78.0	56.3
JUNIOR COLLEGES	100.0	100.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	69.2	56.3
LAW LIBRARIES	92.3	100.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	89.2	96.2
INSTITUTIONAL	88.6	90.8
GOVERNMENT	67.3	13.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	0.0	25.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	74.9	63.2
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	83.1	95.0
PENN STATE UNIVERSITY	65.7	63.3
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH	59.6	93.1
SUMMARY	86.8	87.6

TABLE VII
TURNAROUND TIME IN LENDING LIBRARY

	IN & OUT-OF-STATE		IN-STATE ONLY	
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF TRANS.	LAG	NO. OF TRANS.	LAG
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTER	8101	2.5	7847	2.4
PUBLIC LIBRARY	1030	1.2	1020	1.2
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	863	1.1	820	1.0
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	78	2.1	68	2.0
STATE RELATED UNIV.	266	2.7	139	3.2
PRIVATE COLLEGES	4740	1.1	4138	1.1
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	1364	6.4	737	4.4
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	70	1.9	39	2.3
JUNIOR COLLEGES	3	1.3	3	1.3
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	16	3.9	9	4.2
LAW LIBRARIES	5	0.0	5	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	2254	1.3	2168	1.2
INSTITUTIONAL	157	1.1	143	1.1
GOVERNMENT	208	4.0	28	3.5
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	76	1.0	19	0.8
SPECIAL PROFIT	16	0.8	11	0.5
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	1000	2.2	950	2.1
PENN STATE UNIV.	1335	4.2	840	4.0
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	990	0.0	920	0.0
COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS-PHILADELPHIA	7742	2.2	5688	2.0
TOTALS	30314	2.2	25592	1.9

LAG: Mean number of Days to Dispose of Request

TABLE VIII

TURNAROUND TIME IN BORROWING LIBRARY

A. IN AND OUT-OF-STATE

LIBRARY TYPE	TOTAL NO. OF TRANS.	LAG 1	TOTAL FILLED TRANS.	LAG 2	LAG 3
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	2496	4.6	1256	7.4	12.0
PUBLIC LIBRARY	2090	1.4	879	7.1	8.2
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	804	1.9	414	8.8	10.3
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	151	0.7	77	5.6	6.4
STATE RELATED UNIV.	153	4.8	38	12.0	15.6
PRIVATE COLLEGES	3626	1.6	2235	6.4	7.8
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	420	1.6	300	6.2	9.7
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	41	1.7	28	7.4	8.4
JUNIOR COLLEGES	7	0.1	6	5.0	5.2
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	13	1.3	3	3.3	3.7
LAW LIBRARIES	13	0.2	8	5.8	5.8
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	1253	1.5	1016	6.8	8.4
INSTITUTIONAL	364	1.6	180	6.5	7.8
GOVERNMENT	61	0.8	51	5.7	6.4
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	11	3.9	7	13.6	16.9
SPECIAL PROFIT	431	3.1	279	10.5	13.3
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	65	3.1	25	7.9	11.1
PENN STATE UNIV.	495	2.1	360	9.9	11.9
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH.	47	1.2	28	12.6	13.6
TOTALS	12542	2.4	7190	7.2	9.4

B. IN-STATE ONLY

LIBRARY TYPE					
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	1937	4.6	1117	4.9	11.3
PUBLIC LIBRARY	1386	1.2	866	5.7	8.1
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	661	2.0	368	4.0	10.0
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	127	0.6	70	5.2	5.9
STATE RELATED UNIV.	46	6.6	21	7.0	13.8
PRIVATE COLLEGES	3269	1.5	1098	4.3	7.5
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	342	3.7	280	5.1	8.9
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	32	1.8	22	5.0	7.9
JUNIOR COLLEGES	7	0.1	6	6.2	5.2
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	9	1.2	3	2.3	3.7
LAW LIBRARIES	12	0.1	8	2.9	5.8
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	1087	1.5	927	3.8	8.1
INSTITUTIONAL	323	1.7	174	3.0	7.6
GOVERNMENT	41	0.2	36	3.7	3.4
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	0	—	0	—	—
SPECIAL PROFIT	322	2.8	251	5.5	13.1
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	54	3.0	25	3.6	11.1
PENN STATE UNIV.	325	1.8	265	4.9	10.7
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	28	1.4	14	4.3	13.2
TOTALS	10008	2.3	6550	4.8	8.9

LAG 1: Mean no. of days between date of patron's request and date item was requested by borrowing library.

LAG 2: Mean no. of days between date item was requested by library and date item was received.

LAG 3: Mean no. of days between date of patron's request and date item was received.

TABLE IX

TYPES OF ITEMS BORROWED AND LOANED

TYPE OF LIBRARY		TOTAL NO. OF TRANS.	MONOGRAPH%	PERIODICAL%	AUDIO-VISUAL%	TECH-REP GOV'T DOC%	OTHERS%	NO ENTRY%
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	B	2504	81.8	7.8	3.0	0.2	6.1	1.1
	L	*9314*	*94.5*	*2.3*	*1.0*	*0.1*	*1.9*	*0.2*
PUBLIC LIBRARY	B	2094	74.4	4.2	4.3	1.0	13.9	2.2
	L	*1093*	*80.6*	*8.3*	*2.0*	*0.6*	*8.2*	*0.4*
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	B	814	41.5	53.9	0.2	0.4	3.8	0.2
	L	*938*	*43.3*	*52.0*	*0.3*	*0.5*	*3.9*	*0.0*
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	B	151	60.3	17.2	8.6	4.0	9.9	0.0
	L	*82*	*69.5*	*13.4*	*0.0*	*2.4*	*14.6*	*0.0*
STATE RELATED UNIV.	B	153	58.2	35.9	0.7	0.0	5.2	0.0
	L	*267*	*72.0*	*12.9*	*0.4*	*2.9*	*11.9*	*0.0*
PRIVATE COLLEGES	B	3632	61.0	36.5	0.1	0.2	1.7	0.5
	L	*4834*	*60.4*	*31.9*	*0.1*	*0.4*	*5.9*	*1.2*
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	B	420	32.6	62.0	0.0	0.9	4.5	0.0
	L	*1378*	*47.0*	*44.6*	*0.0*	*1.6*	*6.9*	*0.0*
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	B	41	56.1	36.6	0.0	2.4	4.9	0.0
	L	*79*	*64.6*	*17.7*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*7.6*	*10.1*
JUNIOR COLLEGES	B	7	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*3*	*100.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	B	13	84.6	15.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*16*	*56.3*	*12.5*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*31.3*	*0.0*
LAW LIBRARIES	B	13	15.4	46.2	0.0	0.0	38.5	0.0
	L	*5*	*40.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*60.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	B	1253	14.8	75.9	0.1	0.2	8.5	0.4
	L	*2262*	*15.2*	*84.5*	*0.1*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.2*
INSTITUTIONAL	B	364	38.6	61.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0
	L	*157*	*8.0*	*82.8*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*9.2*	*0.0*
GOVERNMENT	B	62	13.0	29.9	0.0	0.0	57.1	0.0
	L	*216*	*1.9*	*51.4*	*0.0*	*28.2*	*18.5*	*0.0*
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	B	11	18.2	72.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1
	L	*81*	*67.9*	*21.0*	*2.5*	*0.0*	*2.5*	*6.2*
SPECIAL PROFIT	B	431	14.6	82.1	0.0	0.5	2.8	0.0
	L	*19*	*42.1*	*31.6*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*26.3*	*0.0*
STATE LIBRARY	B	65	61.5	35.4	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.0
	L	*1010*	*52.5*	*34.7*	*2.0*	*8.9*	*1.0*	*1.0*
PENN STATE UNIV.	B	495	42.4	44.4	0.0	3.0	10.1	0.0
	L	*1350*	*33.3*	*44.4*	*0.0*	*2.2*	*20.0*	*0.0*
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	B	47	38.3	0.0	2.1	4.3	55.3	0.0
	L	*1010*	*100.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
TOTALS	B	12570	57.2	33.5	1.5	0.6	6.5	0.8
	L	*24115*	*67.9*	*25.5*	*0.6*	*1.1*	*4.5*	*0.4*

TABLE X

SUBJECT CHARACTERISTICS OF ITEMS BORROWED AND LOANED

TYPE OF LIBRARY		NO. OF TRANS.%	SCI-TECH%	HUM.%	SOC. SCI.%	OTHER NON-FICT%	OLD FICT.%	CONT. FICT.%	CHILD YOUTH%	NO ENTRY%
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	B	2504	16.4	17.0	22.3	25.3	6.2	6.4	2.1	4.2
	L	*9314*	*14.1*	*12.0*	*16.0*	*24.7*	*13.4*	*12.7*	*6.2*	*0.9*
PUBLIC LIBRARY	B	2094	13.7	13.4	21.1	22.3	5.2	10.7	5.3	8.4
	L	*1093*	*12.7*	*16.0*	*14.9*	*21.4*	*11.2*	*13.9*	*9.0*	*0.9*
STATE OWNED COLL	B	814	37.8	21.3	33.4	4.8	1.2	0.1	0.7	0.8
	L	*938*	*26.0*	*19.0*	*42.3*	*8.4*	*0.2*	*1.4*	*0.6*	*1.9*
COMMUNITY COLL.	B	151	33.8	22.5	35.1	4.6	2.0	1.3	0.0	0.7
	L	*82*	*25.6*	*25.6*	*34.1*	*6.1*	*6.1*	*2.4*	*0.0*	*0.0*
STATE RELATED UNIV.	B	153	18.3	28.8	44.4	7.2	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.7
	L	*267*	*17.7*	*16.0*	*46.9*	*12.9*	*3.6*	*1.8*	*0.0*	*1.1*
PRIVATE COLL.	B	3632	25.5	27.5	40.6	4.1	1.0	0.8	0.1	0.5
	L	*4834*	*27.6*	*25.9*	*35.6*	*4.4*	*2.0*	*1.7*	*0.4*	*2.4*
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	B	421	64.1	12.2	22.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*1378*	*58.2*	*18.5*	*22.4*	*1.1*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	B	41	14.6	58.5	14.6	4.9	0.0	4.9	2.4	0.0
	L	*79*	*2.5*	*59.5*	*8.9*	*17.7*	*0.0*	*1.3*	*0.0*	*10.1*
JUNIOR COLL.	B	7	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0
	L	*3*	*0.0*	*33.3*	*66.7*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
SPECIALIZED SCH.	B	13	0.0	38.5	23.1	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*16*	*6.3*	*87.5*	*6.3*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
LAW LIBRARIES	B	13	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*5*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*100.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
MEDICAL LIB.	B	1253	93.4	0.8	5.1	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*2262*	*96.5*	*0.1*	*3.2*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.2*
INSTITUTIONAL	B	364	81.4	0.0	12.2	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*157*	*39.5*	*3.8*	*54.8*	*0.0*	*1.9*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
GOVERNMENT	B	61	26.0	0.0	74.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*216*	*6.9*	*0.5*	*92.6*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	B	11	90.9	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*81*	*11.1*	*16.0*	*49.4*	*17.3*	*3.7*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*2.5*
SPECIAL PROFIT	B	431	95.6	0.9	2.6	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
	L	*19*	*94.7*	*5.3*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
STATE LIBRARY	B	65	52.3	3.1	38.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.2
	L	*1010*	*23.8*	*10.9*	*53.5*	*6.9*	*1.0*	*2.0*	*0.0*	*2.0*
PENN STATE UNIV.	B	495	32.3	26.3	41.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*1350*	*63.3*	*22.2*	*12.2*	*2.2*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH.	B	47	10.6	21.3	8.5	53.2	2.1	4.3	0.0	0.0
	L	*1010*	*26.7*	*27.7*	*12.9*	*21.8*	*5.0*	*5.9*	*0.0*	*0.0*
TOTALS	B	12570	34.9	17.4	26.9	10.9	2.5	3.4	1.4	2.5
	L	*24115*	*31.3*	*15.8*	*22.7*	*13.4*	*6.4*	*6.3*	*2.9*	*1.1*

TABLE XI

SUBJECT CHARACTERISTICS OF ITEMS LOANED IN-STATE

LENDING LIBRARY LIBRARY TYPE	TOTAL NO. OF TRANS.	SCI-TECH	HUM.	SOC. SCI.	OTHER NON-FICT.	OLD FICT.	CONT. FICT.	CHILD-YOUTH	NO ENTRY
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTER	8777	14.3	12.5	15.6	23.4	14.1	12.7	6.5	0.8
PUBLIC LIBRARY	1082	12.6	16.2	14.8	21.1	11.3	14.1	9.1	0.9
STATE OWNED COLL.	885	26.3	18.4	42.6	8.6	0.2	1.4	0.7	1.8
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	72	23.6	26.4	33.3	6.9	6.9	2.8	0.0	0.0
STATE RELATED UNIV.	137	17.5	14.7	51.2	10.4	5.5	0.7	0.0	0.0
PRIVATE COLLEGES	4178	28.2	24.3	37.0	4.7	1.3	2.0	0.5	2.0
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	744	76.5	8.8	13.7	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	40	5.0	70.0	7.5	15.0	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0
JUNIOR COLLEGES	3	0.0	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	9	11.1	77.8	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	5	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	2172	97.1	0.1	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
INSTITUTIONAL	143	43.5	4.2	50.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
GOVERNMENT	28	0.0	3.6	96.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	20	20.0	25.0	40.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	12	91.7	8.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STATE LIBRARY	960	21.9	11.5	54.2	7.3	1.0	2.1	0.0	0.0
PENN STATE UNIV.	855	68.4	21.1	8.8	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	940	27.7	26.6	11.7	22.3	5.3	6.4	0.0	0.0
SUMMARY	21064	31.6	14.9	21.5	13.7	7.1	6.9	3.3	0.0

TABLE XII

SUBJECT CHARACTERISTICS OF ITEMS BORROWED IN-STATE

LIBRARY TYPE	TOTAL NO. OF TRANS.	SCI-TECH	HUM.	SOC. SCI.	OTHER NON-FICT.	OLD FICT.	CONT. FICT.	CHILD-YOUTH	NO ENTRY
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTER	1945	16.4	17.3	22.4	26.4	6.5	6.4	2.0	2.6
PUBLIC LIBRARY	1389	14.7	13.7	22.1	21.7	6.4	11.1	6.4	3.8
STATE OWNED COLL.	671	41.1	19.1	34.3	3.3	0.8	0.1	0.3	1.0
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	127	33.9	22.0	33.9	5.5	2.4	1.6	0.0	0.8
STATE RELATED UNIV.	46	19.6	30.4	45.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2
PRIVATE COLLEGES	3274	24.7	27.0	42.0	4.1	1.0	0.9	0.1	0.1
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	342	71.9	8.9	18.6	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	32	18.8	50.0	15.6	6.3	0.0	6.3	3.1	0.0
JUNIOR COLLEGES	7	71.4	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	0.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	9	0.0	44.4	11.1	44.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	12	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	1087	93.9	0.9	4.5	0.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2
INSTITUTIONAL	323	82.1	0.0	10.7	7.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
GOVERNMENT	41	9.7	0.0	90.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	322	94.7	1.2	2.8	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3
STATE LIBRARY	54	55.6	1.9	35.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4
PENN STATE UNIV.	325	38.5	18.5	43.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	28	7.1	14.3	0.0	75.0	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0
SUMMARY	10035	36.5	17.0	27.8	10.4	2.6	3.1	1.3	1.2

TABLE XIII

TYPES OF ITEMS LENT IN VARIOUS SUBJECTS

SUBJECT	NO. OF ITEMS	MONOGRAPH %	PERIODICAL %	AUDIO-VISUAL %	TECH-REP GOV'T & DOC %	OTHER
SCIENCE-TECH.	7558	40.0	53.9	0.0	1.4	4.5
HUMANITIES	3817	79.8	14.1	1.9	0.0	3.7
SOCIAL SCIENCE	5474	66.5	24.3	0.3	2.1	6.8
OTHER NON-FICTION	3232	91.1	4.7	0.8	0.5	2.8
OLD FICTION	1546	98.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CONTEMPORARY FICTION	1519	96.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CHILDREN-YOUTH	704	89.4	0.0	2.3	0.0	7.5
SUMMARY	23850	67.9	25.5	0.6	1.1	4.5

TABLE XIV

TYPES OF ITEMS BORROWED IN VARIOUS SUBJECTS

SUBJECT	NO. OF ITEMS	MONOGRAPH %	PERIODICAL %	AUDIO-VISUAL %	TECH-REP GOV'T & DOC %	OTHER
SCIENCE-TECH.	4391	30.3	63.2	0.3	1.2	4.7
HUMANITIES	2192	76.6	17.8	1.3	0.1	3.8
SOCIAL SCIENCE	3383	67.0	25.5	1.4	0.3	5.4
OTHER NON-FICTION	1376	71.6	10.9	2.6	0.2	14.4
OLD FICTION	315	84.7	2.1	1.5	0.0	11.6
CONTEMPORARY FICTION	422	85.7	0.0	0.5	0.0	13.4
CHILDREN-YOUTH	175	68.4	0.0	16.6	2.3	12.8
SUMMARY	12254	57.2	34.2	1.3	0.6	6.4

TABLE XV

PUBLICATION YEAR BY SUBJECT - TOTAL LENDING

PUBLICATION YEAR

SUBJECT	NO. OF ITEMS	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900
SCIENCE-TECH.	7558	1.8	16.3	13.1	10.3	7.4	7.8	4.8	3.8	3.2	2.1	10.4	5.9	4.5	2.4	1.4	0.4	0.5	1.7	0.6
CUMULATIVE		*1.8*	*18.1*	*31.2*	*41.5*	*48.9*	*56.7*	*61.5*	*65.3*	*68.5*	*70.6*	*81.0*	*86.9*	*91.4*	*93.8*	*95.2*	*95.6*	*96.1*	*97.8*	*98.4*
HUMANITIES	3817	0.9	5.3	5.0	7.5	3.5	3.9	5.8	4.5	3.2	3.1	11.1	11.3	5.6	3.4	1.3	1.3	1.9	11.9	4.7
CUMULATIVE		*0.9*	*6.2*	*11.2*	*18.7*	*22.2*	*26.1*	*31.9*	*36.4*	*39.6*	*42.7*	*53.8*	*65.1*	*70.7*	*74.1*	*75.4*	*76.7*	*78.6*	*90.5*	*95.2*
SOCIAL SCI.	5474	1.8	13.4	10.6	7.6	6.1	7.4	7.1	4.6	4.0	3.9	7.0	8.8	3.2	2.7	1.7	0.8	1.4	2.8	2.7
CUMULATIVE		*1.8*	*15.2*	*25.8*	*33.4*	*39.5*	*46.9*	*54.0*	*58.6*	*62.6*	*66.5*	*73.5*	*82.3*	*85.5*	*88.2*	*89.9*	*90.7*	*92.1*	*94.9*	*97.3*
OTHER NON-FICTION	3233	5.4	20.0	6.2	7.7	8.0	5.1	2.1	3.7	3.5	2.2	6.9	10.4	2.4	1.3	1.8	1.5	0.4	2.4	2.2
CUMULATIVE		*5.4*	*25.4*	*31.6*	*39.3*	*47.3*	*52.4*	*54.5*	*58.2*	*61.7*	*63.9*	*70.8*	*81.2*	*83.6*	*84.9*	*86.7*	*88.2*	*88.6*	*91.0*	*93.2*
OLD FICTION	1546	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.4	2.2	1.2	0.5	0.7	5.3	11.3	19.6	9.2	9.7	8.5	9.8	6.2	10.2	2.5
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.3*	*0.3*	*0.4*	*0.8*	*3.0*	*4.2*	*4.7*	*5.4*	*10.7*	*22.0*	*41.6*	*50.8*	*60.7*	*69.2*	*79.0*	*85.2*	*95.2*	*97.7*
CONTEMPORARY FICTION	1519	10.1	31.0	12.4	4.5	7.9	13.5	4.1	4.5	6.2	0.3	0.8	1.5	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*10.1*	*41.1*	*53.5*	*58.0*	*65.9*	*79.4*	*83.5*	*88.0*	*94.2*	*94.5*	*95.3*	*96.8*	*97.3*	*97.6*	*97.7*	*97.7*	*97.7*	*97.8*	*97.8*
CHILDREN-YOUTH	704	0.2	2.7	6.4	5.7	3.2	14.1	2.0	2.9	10.3	10.7	10.3	13.9	3.7	3.4	1.2	0.5	0.9	1.1	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.2*	*2.9*	*9.3*	*15.0*	*18.2*	*32.3*	*34.3*	*37.2*	*47.5*	*58.2*	*68.5*	*82.4*	*86.1*	*89.5*	*90.7*	*91.2*	*92.1*	*93.2*	*93.2*
SUMMARY	23851	2.5	13.9	9.2	7.7	6.0	6.9	4.8	3.9	3.7	3.0	8.7	8.9	4.1	2.8	1.9	1.4	1.3	4.1	2.0
CUMULATIVE		*2.5*	*16.4*	*25.6*	*33.3*	*39.3*	*46.2*	*51.0*	*54.9*	*58.6*	*61.6*	*70.3*	*79.2*	*83.3*	*86.1*	*88.0*	*89.4*	*90.7*	*94.8*	*96.8*

TABLE XVI

PUBLICATION YEAR BY SUBJECT - TOTAL BORROWING

PUBLICATION YEAR

SUBJECT	NO. OF ITEMS	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900
SCIENCE-TECH.	4245	2.6	17.3	14.3	9.1	8.0	5.3	4.0	3.7	2.9	3.0	8.1	5.2	4.0	2.3	0.9	1.4	1.6	2.6	0.3
CUMULATIVE		*2.6*	*19.9*	*34.2*	*43.3*	*51.3*	*56.6*	*60.6*	*64.3*	*67.2*	*70.2*	*78.3*	*83.5*	*87.5*	*89.8*	*90.7*	*92.1*	*93.7*	*96.3*	
HUMANITIES	2040	0.9	7.1	6.0	5.1	5.3	4.8	4.8	4.5	3.1	3.2	10.1	9.8	5.2	4.8	2.1	1.8	1.7	8.5	4.4
CUMULATIVE		*0.9*	*8.0*	*14.0*	*19.1*	*24.4*	*29.2*	*34.0*	*38.5*	*41.6*	*44.8*	*54.9*	*64.7*	*69.9*	*74.7*	*76.8*	*78.6*	*80.3*	*88.8*	
SOCIAL SCI.	3196	3.2	10.5	10.0	7.3	6.1	5.7	4.8	5.6	3.3	3.2	7.5	9.3	4.2	2.3	1.8	0.8	1.7	4.6	2.5
CUMULATIVE		*3.2*	*13.7*	*23.7*	*31.0*	*37.1*	*42.8*	*47.6*	*53.2*	*56.5*	*59.7*	*67.2*	*76.5*	*80.7*	*83.0*	*84.8*	*85.6*	*87.3*	*91.9*	
OTHER NON-FICTION	1185	3.4	15.1	10.5	7.6	6.4	4.7	4.5	3.8	2.5	1.6	5.3	5.4	2.1	1.9	2.0	0.7	1.0	4.1	3.5
CUMULATIVE		*3.4*	*18.5*	*29.0*	*36.6*	*43.0*	*47.7*	*52.2*	*56.0*	*58.5*	*60.1*	*65.4*	*70.8*	*72.9*	*74.8*	*76.8*	*77.5*	*78.5*	*82.6*	
OLD FICTION	268	0.0	1.1	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.6	0.6	0.0	0.8	3.3	9.7	18.1	13.4	8.8	6.5	4.2	4.5	10.3	1.3
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*1.1*	*2.1*	*2.4*	*2.7*	*3.3*	*3.9*	*3.9*	*4.7*	*8.0*	*17.7*	*35.8*	*49.2*	*58.0*	*64.5*	*68.7*	*73.2*	*83.5*	
CONTEMPORARY FICTION	370	15.3	23.7	10.7	8.2	7.7	3.3	5.1	3.2	3.2	0.9	4.1	1.8	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*15.3*	*39.0*	*49.7*	*57.9*	*65.6*	*68.9*	*74.0*	*77.2*	*80.4*	*91.3*	*95.4*	*97.2*	*97.7*	*97.7*	*97.7*	*97.7*	*97.7*	*97.7*	
CHILDREN-YOUTH	146	1.3	6.8	2.3	9.0	6.5	2.1	8.4	6.0	4.7	4.0	4.8	14.2	5.5	1.8	2.3	1.4	1.9	0.6	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*1.3*	*8.1*	*10.4*	*19.4*	*25.9*	*28.0*	*32.4*	*38.4*	*43.1*	*47.1*	*51.9*	*66.1*	*71.6*	*73.4*	*75.7*	*77.1*	*80.0*	*80.6*	
SUMMARY	11450	3.0	12.9	10.4	7.4	6.6	5.0	4.4	4.2	3.0	2.8	7.7	7.4	4.1	2.7	1.6	1.3	1.6	4.4	2.0
CUMULATIVE		*3.0*	*15.9*	*26.3*	*33.7*	*40.3*	*45.3*	*49.7*	*53.9*	*56.9*	*59.7*	*67.4*	*74.8*	*78.9*	*81.6*	*83.2*	*84.5*	*86.1*	*90.5*	

TABLE XVII
PUBLICATION YEAR OF ITEMS LENT, TOTAL

LENDING LIBRARY

LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF TRANS.	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900	NO Entry
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	9314	4.2	16.4	7.7	7.3	6.3	8.1	3.9	3.4	3.5	3.4	8.0	10.0	3.4	2.2	2.6	1.9	1.0	3.1	0.2	3.6
CUMULATIVE		*4.2*	*20.6*	*28.3*	*35.6*	*41.9*	*50.0*	*53.9*	*57.3*	*60.8*	*64.2*	*72.2*	*82.2*	*85.6*	*87.8*	*90.4*	*92.3*	*93.3*	*96.4*	*96.6*	
PUBLIC LIB.	1093	3.4	15.4	8.6	8.3	2.7	8.8	4.9	3.5	5.7	3.1	12.4	7.8	4.2	2.4	0.9	1.2	0.2	1.4	0.3	5.1
CUMULATIVE		*3.4*	*18.8*	*27.4*	*35.7*	*38.4*	*47.2*	*52.1*	*55.6*	*61.3*	*64.4*	*76.8*	*84.6*	*88.8*	*91.2*	*92.1*	*93.3*	*93.5*	*94.9*	*95.2*	
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	938	1.4	8.5	15.3	9.4	7.3	4.4	5.7	5.8	3.8	2.9	5.3	6.3	3.7	2.6	1.1	1.5	1.1	4.2	0.8	8.7
CUMULATIVE		*1.4*	*9.9*	*25.2*	*34.6*	*41.9*	*46.3*	*52.0*	*57.8*	*61.6*	*64.5*	*69.8*	*76.1*	*79.8*	*82.4*	*83.5*	*85.0*	*86.1*	*90.3*	*91.1*	
COMMUNITY COLL.	82	1.2	12.2	6.1	12.2	7.3	3.7	2.4	9.8	4.9	0.0	13.4	7.3	4.9	2.4	2.4	0.0	1.2	3.7	2.4	2.4
CUMULATIVE		*1.2*	*13.4*	*19.5*	*31.7*	*39.0*	*42.7*	*45.1*	*54.9*	*59.8*	*59.8*	*73.2*	*80.5*	*85.4*	*87.8*	*90.2*	*90.2*	*91.4*	*95.1*	*97.5*	
STATE RELATED UNIV.	267	0.0	11.3	4.3	6.8	5.8	8.6	9.4	8.6	6.8	2.2	5.1	4.0	4.3	3.2	2.5	1.1	5.0	5.1	3.3	2.5
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*11.3*	*15.6*	*22.4*	*28.2*	*36.8*	*46.2*	*54.8*	*61.6*	*63.8*	*68.9*	*72.9*	*77.2*	*80.4*	*82.9*	*84.0*	*89.0*	*94.1*	*97.4*	
PRIVATE COLL.	4834	1.3	8.1	7.3	4.4	5.1	4.8	4.8	5.0	3.1	3.0	10.1	11.5	5.7	5.7	1.9	1.0	2.2	6.3	3.9	4.9
CUMULATIVE		*1.3*	*9.4*	*16.7*	*21.1*	*26.2*	*31.0*	*35.8*	*40.8*	*43.9*	*46.9*	*57.0*	*68.5*	*74.2*	*79.9*	*81.8*	*82.8*	*85.0*	*91.3*	*95.2*	
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	1378	0.5	18.6	10.2	9.8	5.7	3.6	6.2	4.7	1.0	2.1	5.1	3.6	3.6	3.1	0.0	1.1	1.1	10.0	10.0	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.5*	*19.1*	*29.3*	*39.1*	*44.8*	*48.4*	*54.6*	*59.3*	*60.3*	*62.4*	*67.5*	*71.1*	*74.7*	*77.8*	*77.8*	*78.9*	*80.0*	*90.0*	*100.0*	
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	79	1.3	3.8	5.1	2.5	1.3	5.1	3.8	1.3	2.5	1.3	11.4	8.9	1.3	0.0	0.0	2.5	5.1	11.4	16.5	15.2
CUMULATIVE		*1.3*	*5.1*	*10.2*	*12.7*	*14.0*	*19.1*	*22.9*	*24.2*	*26.7*	*28.0*	*39.4*	*48.3*	*49.6*	*49.6*	*49.6*	*52.1*	*57.2*	*68.6*	*85.1*	
JUNIOR COLL.	3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*33.3*	*33.3*	*33.3*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	*66.6*	
SPECIALIZED SCH.	16	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	6.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	18.8	18.8
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*6.3*	*6.3*	*6.3*	*6.3*	*6.3*	*6.3*	*6.3*	*31.3*	*31.3*	*37.6*	*37.6*	*37.6*	*37.6*	*62.6*	*81.4*	
LAW LIBRARIES	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*40.0*	*60.0*	*80.0*	*80.0*	*80.0*	*80.0*	*80.0*	*80.0*	*80.0*	
MEDICAL LIB.	2262	2.4	16.1	16.7	15.6	7.4	8.4	2.5	3.2	3.8	1.4	8.3	4.4	2.4	0.8	1.9	0.0	0.0	3.7	0.0	0.9
CUMULATIVE		*2.4*	*18.5*	*35.2*	*50.8*	*58.2*	*66.6*	*69.1*	*72.3*	*76.1*	*77.5*	*85.8*	*90.2*	*92.6*	*93.4*	*95.3*	*95.3*	*95.3*	*99.0*	*99.0*	
INSTITUTIONAL	157	0.6	20.1	14.8	11.6	7.4	9.6	8.5	1.8	1.1	3.7	4.1	14.1	0.0	0.6	0.0	1.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.6*	*20.7*	*35.5*	*47.1*	*54.5*	*64.1*	*72.6*	*74.4*	*75.5*	*79.2*	*83.3*	*97.4*	*97.4*	*98.0*	*98.0*	*99.8*	*99.8*	*99.8*	*99.8*	

CONTINUED

TABLE XVII
PUBLICATION YEAR OF ITEMS LENT, TOTAL

LENDING LIBRARY

LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF TRANS.	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900	No Entry
GOVERNMENT	216	10.2	13.4	27.8	1.9	0.5	0.9	8.8	0.0	17.6	8.8	9.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*10.2*	*23.6*	*51.4*	*53.3*	*53.8*	*54.7*	*63.5*	*63.5*	*81.1*	*89.9*	*99.2*	*99.7*	*99.7*	*99.7*	*99.7*	*99.7*	*100.2*	*100.2*	*100.2*	
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	81	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	1.2	0.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.7	2.5	3.7	21.0	56.8	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*1.2*	*1.2*	*2.4*	*2.4*	*2.4*	*4.9*	*7.4*	*9.9*	*12.4*	*16.1*	*18.6*	*22.3*	*43.3*	*100.1*	
SPECIAL PROFIT	19	0.0	21.1	5.3	0.0	5.3	21.1	5.3	10.5	10.5	0.0	5.3	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	5.3
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*21.1*	*26.4*	*26.4*	*31.7*	*52.8*	*58.1*	*68.6*	*79.1*	*79.1*	*84.4*	*89.7*	*89.7*	*89.7*	*89.7*	*89.7*	*95.0*	*95.0*	*95.0*	
STATE LIBRARY	1010	0.0	12.9	14.9	7.9	5.0	5.9	11.9	6.9	6.9	2.0	7.9	8.9	2.0	0.0	3.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*12.9*	*27.8*	*35.7*	*40.7*	*46.6*	*58.5*	*65.4*	*72.3*	*74.3*	*82.2*	*91.1*	*93.1*	*93.1*	*96.1*	*96.1*	*97.1*	*98.1*	*99.1*	
PENN STATE UNIV.	1350	0.0	13.3	7.8	6.7	6.7	6.7	4.4	2.2	2.2	3.3	14.4	7.8	7.8	5.6	0.0	3.3	1.1	3.3	1.1	2.2
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*13.3*	*21.1*	*27.8*	*34.5*	*41.2*	*45.6*	*47.8*	*50.0*	*53.3*	*67.7*	*75.5*	*83.3*	*88.9*	*88.9*	*92.2*	*93.3*	*96.6*	*97.7*	
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	1010	1.0	11.9	2.0	7.9	9.9	9.9	6.9	1.0	4.6	5.0	6.9	10.9	5.9	1.0	1.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	6.9
CUMULATIVE		*1.0*	*12.9*	*14.9*	*22.8*	*32.7*	*42.6*	*49.5*	*50.5*	*55.1*	*60.1*	*67.0*	*77.9*	*83.8*	*84.8*	*85.8*	*85.8*	*88.8*	*90.8*	*93.8*	
TOTAL	24115	2.5	13.8	9.2	7.7	6.0	6.9	4.8	3.9	3.6	3.0	8.7	8.9	4.1	2.8	1.9	1.3	1.3	4.1	2.0	3.6
CUMULATIVE		*2.5*	*16.3*	*25.5*	*33.2*	*39.2*	*46.1*	*50.9*	*54.8*	*58.4*	*61.4*	*70.1*	*79.0*	*83.1*	*85.9*	*87.8*	*89.1*	*90.4*	*94.5*	*96.5*	

TABLE XVIII

PUBLICATION YEAR OF ITEMS BORROWED, TOTAL

BORROWING LIBRARY / LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF TRANS.	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900	No Entry
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	2504	3.0	14.4	9.6	7.4	6.7	5.3	5.5	4.2	3.4	1.8	7.5	7.3	3.5	2.7	1.9	1.4	0.7	4.5	0.8	8.3
CUMULATIVE		*3.0*	*17.4*	*27.0*	*34.4*	*41.1*	*46.4*	*51.9*	*56.1*	*59.5*	*61.3*	*68.8*	*76.1*	*79.6*	*82.3*	*84.2*	*85.6*	*86.3*	*90.8*	*91.6*	
PUBLIC LIB.	2094	5.6	12.4	8.0	4.9	5.4	4.4	3.8	3.7	3.1	2.8	6.4	6.3	2.5	1.6	1.5	0.8	0.6	2.2	1.0	23.2
CUMULATIVE		*5.6*	*18.0*	*26.0*	*30.9*	*36.3*	*40.7*	*44.5*	*48.2*	*51.3*	*54.1*	*60.5*	*66.8*	*69.3*	*70.9*	*72.4*	*73.2*	*73.8*	*76.0*	*77.0*	
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	814	1.3	13.2	10.6	8.3	6.1	6.6	4.6	3.3	3.4	2.7	6.8	7.0	5.0	2.8	2.1	2.0	1.6	5.9	3.0	3.6
CUMULATIVE		*1.3*	*14.5*	*25.1*	*33.4*	*39.5*	*46.1*	*50.7*	*54.0*	*57.4*	*60.1*	*66.9*	*73.9*	*78.9*	*81.7*	*83.8*	*85.8*	*87.4*	*93.3*	*96.3*	
COMMUNITY COLL.	151	2.0	11.3	8.6	9.9	6.0	4.6	6.6	5.3	3.3	2.6	8.6	9.3	4.0	3.3	1.3	0.0	2.0	2.6	0.7	7.9
CUMULATIVE		*2.0*	*13.3*	*21.9*	*31.8*	*37.8*	*42.4*	*49.0*	*54.3*	*57.6*	*60.2*	*68.8*	*78.1*	*82.1*	*85.4*	*86.7*	*86.7*	*88.7*	*91.3*	*92.0*	
STATE RELATED UNIV.	153	0.0	9.8	9.2	5.9	3.3	4.6	5.2	5.9	2.6	1.3	5.2	9.8	5.2	5.9	2.6	1.3	3.9	10.5	4.6	3.3
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*9.8*	*19.0*	*24.9*	*28.2*	*32.8*	*38.0*	*43.9*	*46.5*	*47.8*	*53.0*	*62.8*	*68.0*	*73.9*	*76.5*	*77.8*	*81.7*	*92.2*	*96.8*	
PRIVATE COLL.	3632	1.9	7.1	8.6	7.0	6.0	5.3	4.1	5.3	3.2	4.1	9.3	10.4	6.2	3.7	1.6	1.6	3.0	5.1	2.2	4.2
CUMULATIVE		*1.9*	*9.0*	*17.6*	*24.6*	*30.6*	*35.9*	*40.0*	*45.3*	*48.5*	*52.6*	*61.9*	*72.3*	*78.5*	*82.2*	*83.8*	*85.4*	*88.4*	*93.5*	*95.7*	
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	421	2.7	17.7	18.0	5.5	10.7	7.8	3.4	3.1	0.9	2.1	4.6	4.8	0.9	2.0	1.4	2.5	0.9	4.5	5.9	0.5
CUMULATIVE		*2.7*	*20.4*	*38.4*	*43.9*	*54.6*	*62.4*	*65.8*	*68.9*	*69.8*	*71.9*	*76.5*	*81.3*	*82.2*	*84.2*	*85.6*	*88.1*	*89.0*	*93.5*	*99.4*	
THEOLOGICAL SEM	41	2.4	24.4	17.1	2.4	4.9	4.9	2.4	2.4	0.0	4.9	4.9	7.3	0.0	2.4	0.0	2.4	2.4	4.9	4.9	4.9
CUMULATIVE		*2.4*	*26.8*	*43.9*	*45.3*	*51.2*	*66.1*	*68.5*	*70.9*	*70.9*	*75.8*	*80.7*	*88.0*	*88.0*	*90.4*	*90.4*	*92.8*	*95.2*	*100.1*	*105.0*	
JUNIOR COLLEGES	7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	14.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.3	14.3	0.0	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*28.6*	*42.9*	*42.9*	*42.9*	*42.9*	*42.9*	*71.5*	*71.5*	*71.5*	*71.5*	*71.5*	*71.5*	*85.8*	*100.1*	*100.1*	
SPECIALIZED SCH.	13	0.0	23.1	7.7	0.0	7.7	15.4	0.0	7.7	7.7	0.0	23.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*23.1*	*30.8*	*30.8*	*38.5*	*53.9*	*53.9*	*61.6*	*69.3*	*69.3*	*92.4*	*92.4*	*92.4*	*92.4*	*92.4*	*92.4*	*92.4*	*100.1*	*100.1*	
LAW LIBRARIES	13	0.0	7.7	0.0	7.7	23.1	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	46.2
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*7.7*	*7.7*	*15.8*	*38.5*	*38.5*	*46.2*	*46.2*	*46.2*	*46.2*	*46.2*	*46.2*	*53.9*	*53.9*	*53.9*	*53.9*	*53.9*	*53.9*	*53.9*	
MEDICAL LIB.	1253	4.6	21.9	15.0	10.4	10.1	3.1	4.7	3.1	2.4	3.1	8.1	4.4	1.6	1.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	2.0	0.8	1.9
CUMULATIVE		*4.6*	*26.5*	*41.5*	*51.9*	*62.0*	*65.1*	*69.8*	*72.9*	*75.3*	*78.4*	*86.5*	*90.9*	*92.5*	*94.1*	*94.6*	*95.0*	*95.4*	*97.4*	*98.2*	
INSTITUTIONAL	364	3.6	25.9	14.7	8.1	3.6	6.0	0.3	2.7	0.7	2.0	7.9	2.1	8.2	4.3	0.0	2.7	0.0	5.5	0.0	1.6
CUMULATIVE		*3.6*	*29.5*	*44.2*	*52.3*	*55.9*	*61.9*	*62.2*	*64.9*	*65.6*	*67.6*	*75.5*	*77.6*	*85.8*	*90.1*	*90.1*	*92.8*	*92.8*	*98.3*	*98.3*	
GOVERNMENT	62	0.0	13.7	12.0	8.1	4.9	3.3	0.0	0.0	1.6	7.6	32.4	4.4	8.8	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*13.7*	*25.7*	*33.8*	*38.7*	*42.0*	*42.0*	*42.0*	*43.6*	*51.2*	*83.6*	*88.0*	*96.8*	*96.8*	*98.4*	*98.4*	*98.4*	*98.4*	*98.4*	
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	11	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	18.2	9.1	9.1	0.0	0.0	18.2	18.2	0.0	9.1
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*9.1*	*9.1*	*9.1*	*9.1*	*9.1*	*9.1*	*18.2*	*36.4*	*45.5*	*54.6*	*54.6*	*54.6*	*72.8*	*91.0*	*91.0*	

CONTINUED

TABLE XVIII
PUBLICATION YEAR OF ITEMS BORROWED, TOTAL

BORROWING LIBRARY

LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF TRANS.	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900	No Entry
SPECIAL PROFIT	431	4.5	20.2	14.3	13.1	4.7	4.0	5.6	6.2	3.6	1.0	5.8	4.6	1.4	2.6	1.0	1.3	2.0	1.0	0.0	2.9
CUMULATIVE		*4.5*	*24.7*	*39.0*	*52.1*	*56.8*	*60.8*	*66.4*	*72.6*	*76.2*	*77.2*	*83.0*	*87.6*	*89.0*	*91.6*	*92.6*	*93.9*	*95.9*	*96.9*	*96.9*	
STATE LIBRARY	65	4.6	7.7	32.3	20.2	7.7	4.6	4.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	6.2	1.5	1.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.5	1.5
CUMULATIVE		*4.6*	*12.3*	*44.6*	*64.8*	*72.5*	*77.1*	*81.7*	*83.2*	*84.7*	*86.2*	*92.4*	*93.9*	*95.4*	*96.9*	*96.9*	*96.9*	*96.9*	*96.9*	*98.4*	
PENN STATE UNIV.	495	0.0	9.1	12.1	6.1	9.1	4.0	6.1	4.0	2.0	2.0	6.1	7.1	4.0	3.0	4.0	0.0	3.0	11.1	7.1	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*9.1*	*21.2*	*27.3*	*36.4*	*40.4*	*46.5*	*50.5*	*52.5*	*54.5*	*60.6*	*67.7*	*71.7*	*74.7*	*78.7*	*78.7*	*81.7*	*92.8*	*99.9*	
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	47	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	6.4	0.0	0.0	2.1	8.5	0.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	2.1	12.8	48.9	6.4
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*4.3*	*10.7*	*10.7*	*10.7*	*12.8*	*21.3*	*21.3*	*23.4*	*25.5*	*27.6*	*27.6*	*29.7*	*29.7*	*31.8*	*44.6*	*93.5*	
TOTAL	121570	3.8	12.9	10.4	7.4	6.6	5.0	4.4	4.2	3.0	2.8	7.7	7.4	4.1	2.7	1.6	1.3	1.6	4.4	2.0	7.6
CUMULATIVE		*3.8*	*16.7*	*27.1*	*34.5*	*41.1*	*46.1*	*50.5*	*54.7*	*57.7*	*60.5*	*68.2*	*75.6*	*79.7*	*82.4*	*84.0*	*85.3*	*86.9*	*91.3*	*93.3*	

TABLE XIX

PUBLICATION YEAR BY SUBJECT - TOTAL MONOGRAPH BORROWING

PUBLICATION YEAR

SUBJECT	NO. OF ITEMS	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900
SCIENCE-TECH.	1256	2.0	10.3	9.0	7.1	9.3	7.5	3.8	3.1	4.4	4.7	11.3	6.5	3.7	2.6	0.9	1.1	2.6	3.9	0.7
CUMULATIVE		*2.0*	*12.3*	*21.3*	*28.4*	*37.7*	*45.2*	*49.0*	*52.1*	*56.5*	*61.2*	*72.5*	*79.0*	*82.7*	*85.3*	*86.2*	*87.3*	*89.9*	*93.8*	*94.5*
HUMANITIES	1561	0.8	7.4	5.3	5.4	5.1	4.5	4.2	4.8	3.2	3.7	11.0	9.2	4.9	5.0	2.0	1.2	1.7	8.9	4.5
CUMULATIVE		*0.8*	*8.2*	*13.5*	*18.9*	*24.0*	*28.5*	*32.7*	*37.5*	*40.7*	*44.4*	*55.4*	*64.6*	*69.5*	*74.5*	*76.5*	*77.7*	*79.4*	*88.3*	*92.8*
SOCIAL SCI.	2158	4.0	8.3	8.5	7.1	5.6	5.8	5.1	6.3	3.1	3.8	7.5	10.2	4.8	3.1	1.6	0.6	2.2	4.7	2.9
CUMULATIVE		*4.0*	*12.3*	*20.8*	*27.9*	*33.5*	*39.3*	*44.4*	*50.7*	*53.8*	*57.6*	*65.1*	*75.3*	*80.1*	*83.2*	*84.8*	*85.4*	*87.6*	*92.3*	*95.2*
OTHER NON-FICTION	873	3.4	15.5	10.7	7.1	7.3	5.2	4.2	4.8	3.0	1.8	6.2	4.8	2.4	2.1	1.9	1.0	1.2	5.4	0.7
CUMULATIVE		*3.4*	*18.9*	*29.6*	*36.7*	*44.0*	*49.2*	*53.4*	*58.2*	*61.2*	*63.0*	*69.2*	*74.0*	*76.4*	*78.5*	*80.4*	*81.4*	*82.6*	*88.0*	*88.7*
OLD FICTION	230	0.0	1.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.8	0.8	0.0	1.0	2.9	10.5	19.0	12.8	10.1	6.5	2.3	5.0	11.8	1.6
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*1.0*	*1.4*	*1.4*	*1.8*	*2.6*	*3.4*	*3.4*	*4.4*	*7.3*	*17.8*	*36.8*	*49.6*	*59.7*	*66.2*	*68.5*	*73.5*	*85.3*	*86.9*
CONTEMPORARY FICTION	321	17.2	25.1	9.1	8.9	6.3	3.0	5.3	3.2	3.3	0.7	4.5	1.9	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*17.2*	*42.3*	*51.4*	*60.3*	*66.6*	*69.6*	*74.9*	*78.2*	*81.5*	*82.2*	*86.7*	*88.6*	*88.9*	*88.9*	*88.9*	*88.9*	*88.9*	*88.9*	*88.9*
CHILDREN-YOUTH	118	1.8	10.0	3.3	11.4	8.7	2.3	9.8	5.3	3.5	1.7	5.3	17.4	6.2	2.6	3.4	2.0	2.8	0.8	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*1.8*	*11.8*	*15.1*	*26.5*	*35.2*	*37.5*	*47.3*	*52.6*	*56.1*	*57.8*	*63.1*	*80.5*	*86.7*	*89.3*	*92.7*	*94.7*	*97.5*	*98.3*	*98.3*
SUMMARY	6517	3.5	10.8	8.3	7.1	6.8	5.7	4.8	5.1	3.5	3.7	9.5	9.2	4.7	3.7	1.9	1.0	2.2	6.0	2.5
CUMULATIVE		*3.5*	*14.3*	*22.6*	*29.7*	*36.5*	*42.2*	*47.0*	*52.1*	*55.6*	*59.3*	*68.8*	*78.0*	*82.7*	*86.4*	*88.3*	*89.3*	*91.5*	*97.5*	*100.0*

TABLE XX

PUBLICATION YEAR BY SUBJECT - TOTAL MONOGRAPH LENDING

PUBLICATION YEAR

SUBJECT	NO. OF ITEMS	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900
SCIENCE-TECH.	2935	1.9	10.1	9.0	10.0	6.9	10.7	6.1	4.3	4.5	3.0	13.3	6.2	4.2	2.5	1.5	0.5	0.6	0.9	1.1
CUMULATIVE		*1.9*	*12.0*	*21.0*	*31.0*	*37.9*	*48.6*	*54.7*	*59.0*	*63.5*	*66.5*	*79.8*	*86.0*	*90.2*	*92.7*	*93.8*	*94.3*	*94.9*	*95.8*	*96.9*
HUMANITIES	2906	0.3	4.7	3.6	7.1	3.1	4.4	6.1	4.6	3.1	3.2	11.4	11.7	6.1	3.6	1.6	0.9	2.3	12.6	5.1
CUMULATIVE		*0.3*	*5.0*	*8.6*	*15.7*	*18.8*	*23.2*	*29.4*	*34.0*	*37.1*	*40.3*	*51.7*	*63.4*	*69.5*	*73.1*	*74.7*	*75.6*	*77.9*	*90.5*	*95.6*
SOCIAL SCI.	3529	1.1	13.0	7.5	8.0	6.1	8.1	7.4	5.4	4.0	4.7	7.2	9.7	3.1	3.0	1.1	0.9	1.6	2.4	2.8
CUMULATIVE		*1.1*	*14.1*	*21.6*	*29.6*	*35.7*	*43.8*	*51.2*	*55.6*	*59.6*	*64.3*	*71.5*	*81.2*	*84.3*	*87.3*	*88.4*	*89.3*	*90.9*	*93.3*	*96.1*
OTHER NON-FICTION	2733	4.3	21.3	6.4	7.8	8.3	5.3	2.2	3.5	2.6	2.3	6.8	10.5	2.3	1.3	1.9	1.4	0.3	2.4	1.9
CUMULATIVE		*4.3*	*25.6*	*32.0*	*39.8*	*48.1*	*53.4*	*55.6*	*59.1*	*61.7*	*64.0*	*70.8*	*81.3*	*83.6*	*84.9*	*86.8*	*88.2*	*88.5*	*90.9*	*92.8*
OLD FICTION	1484	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.3	2.3	1.2	0.5	0.6	5.4	11.2	19.6	9.3	9.7	8.6	10.0	6.2	10.1	2.4
CUMULATIVE		*0.0*	*0.2*	*0.2*	*0.2*	*0.5*	*2.8*	*4.0*	*4.5*	*5.1*	*10.5*	*21.7*	*41.3*	*50.3*	*60.0*	*68.6*	*78.6*	*84.8*	*94.9*	*97.3*
CONTEMPORARY FICTION	1437	10.2	30.4	12.2	4.4	8.0	13.8	4.2	4.6	6.4	0.4	0.7	1.6	0.5	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*10.2*	*40.6*	*52.8*	*57.2*	*65.2*	*79.0*	*83.2*	*87.8*	*94.2*	*94.6*	*95.3*	*96.9*	*97.4*	*97.7*	*97.8*	*97.8*	*97.8*	*97.8*	*97.8*
CHILDREN-YOUTH	590	0.3	2.8	6.8	6.1	3.1	14.5	2.1	2.4	10.3	12.0	9.3	12.7	4.1	3.3	1.4	0.5	1.0	1.2	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*0.3*	*3.1*	*9.9*	*16.0*	*19.1*	*33.6*	*35.7*	*38.1*	*48.4*	*60.4*	*69.7*	*82.4*	*86.5*	*89.8*	*91.2*	*91.7*	*92.7*	*93.9*	*93.9*
SUMMARY	15614	2.5	12.9	6.8	7.3	5.8	7.9	5.1	4.2	4.0	3.8	9.3	10.3	4.3	3.2	2.1	1.8	1.6	4.7	2.5
CUMULATIVE		*2.5*	*15.4*	*22.2*	*29.5*	*35.3*	*43.2*	*48.3*	*52.5*	*56.5*	*60.3*	*69.6*	*79.9*	*84.2*	*87.4*	*89.5*	*91.3*	*92.9*	*97.6*	*100.1*

TABLE XXI

PUBLICATION YEAR BY SUBJECT - TOTAL PERIODICAL BORROWING

PUBLICATION YEAR

SUBJECT	NO. OF ITEMS	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974	1973	1972	1971	1970	1969	1965-1968	1960-1964	1955-1959	1950-1954	1945-1949	1940-1944	1935-1939	1900-1934	Before 1900
SCIENCE-TECH.	2741	2.7	18.9	17.4	10.5	7.7	4.5	4.1	4.0	2.3	2.3	7.1	4.4	4.2	2.3	1.0	1.6	1.3	2.5	0.2
CUMULATIVE		*2.7*	*21.6*	*39.0*	*49.5*	*57.2*	*61.7*	*65.8*	*69.8*	*72.1*	*74.4*	*81.5*	*85.9*	*90.1*	*92.4*	*93.4*	*95.0*	*96.3*	*98.8*	*99.0*
HUMANITIES	384	1.7	6.9	10.0	4.2	6.5	7.1	6.4	2.2	3.6	2.0	6.4	11.2	7.2	4.9	2.1	4.9	0.6	6.5	4.1
CUMULATIVE		*1.7*	*8.6*	*18.6*	*22.8*	*29.3*	*36.4*	*42.8*	*45.0*	*48.6*	*50.6*	*57.0*	*68.2*	*75.4*	*80.3*	*82.4*	*87.3*	*87.9*	*94.4*	*98.5*
SOCIAL SCIENCE	838	1.5	17.5	14.7	9.1	7.4	6.2	4.1	4.1	3.7	2.2	6.4	8.7	2.8	0.9	1.3	1.4	0.9	4.7	0.6
CUMULATIVE		*1.5*	*19.0*	*33.7*	*42.8*	*50.2*	*56.4*	*60.5*	*64.6*	*68.3*	*70.5*	*76.9*	*85.6*	*88.4*	*89.3*	*90.6*	*92.0*	*92.9*	*97.6*	*98.2*
OTHER NON-FICT.	150	6.7	19.5	19.3	12.0	6.1	4.7	6.2	1.6	2.3	0.0	2.0	10.8	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.0	0.7	0.0	3.5
CUMULATIVE		*6.7*	*26.2*	*45.5*	*57.5*	*63.6*	*68.3*	*74.5*	*76.1*	*78.4*	*78.4*	*80.4*	*91.2*	*91.2*	*91.2*	*95.3*	*95.3*	*96.0*	*96.0*	*99.5*
SUMMARY	4113	2.5	17.8	16.5	9.8	7.6	5.2	4.5	3.9	2.7	2.2	6.8	6.2	4.1	2.2	1.3	1.9	1.1	3.0	0.8
		2.5	*20.3*	*36.8*	*46.6*	*54.2*	*59.4*	*63.9*	*67.8*	*70.5*	*72.7*	*79.5*	*85.7*	*89.8*	*92.0*	*93.3*	*95.2*	*96.3*	*99.3*	*100.1*

TABLE XXII

PUBLICATION YEAR BY SUBJECT - TOTAL PERIODICAL LENDING

SCIENCE-TECH.	4052	1.9	21.5	15.4	11.3	8.0	5.8	4.3	2.8	2.2	1.7	7.9	5.3	4.6	2.2	1.4	0.3	0.5	2.3	0.0
CUMULATIVE		*1.9*	*22.4*	*37.8*	*49.1*	*57.1*	*62.9*	*67.2*	*70.0*	*72.2*	*73.9*	*81.8*	*87.1*	*91.7*	*93.9*	*95.3*	*95.6*	*96.1*	*98.4*	*98.4*
HUMANITIES	539	4.2	7.9	14.7	2.7	7.5	2.8	6.5	4.3	3.8	0.9	11.9	9.1	1.2	2.9	0.2	3.8	0.0	12.0	3.5
CUMULATIVE		*4.2*	*12.1*	*26.8*	*29.5*	*37.0*	*39.8*	*46.3*	*50.6*	*54.4*	*55.3*	*66.2*	*75.3*	*76.5*	*79.4*	*79.6*	*83.4*	*83.4*	*95.4*	*98.9*
SOCIAL SCIENCE	1328	4.4	17.4	18.4	8.2	4.9	6.0	6.6	2.1	3.2	1.3	6.2	8.0	3.2	1.4	2.6	0.7	1.4	3.8	0.3
CUMULATIVE		*4.4*	*21.8*	*40.2*	*48.4*	*53.3*	*59.3*	*65.9*	*68.0*	*71.2*	*72.5*	*78.7*	*86.7*	*89.9*	*91.3*	*93.9*	*94.6*	*96.0*	*99.8*	*100.1*
OTHER NON-FICT.	149	30.6	7.2	5.9	8.4	1.3	3.1	0.7	5.3	2.6	0.7	2.0	13.1	2.0	0.7	0.7	3.9	3.3	3.3	4.0
CUMULATIVE		*30.6*	*37.8*	*43.7*	*52.1*	*53.4*	*56.5*	*57.2*	*62.5*	*65.1*	*65.8*	*67.8*	*80.9*	*82.9*	*83.6*	*84.3*	*88.2*	*91.5*	*94.8*	*98.8*
SUMMARY	6068	3.4	19.1	15.9	9.8	7.1	5.5	5.0	2.9	2.6	1.5	7.8	6.5	3.9	2.0	1.6	0.8	0.7	3.5	0.5
		3.4	*22.5*	*38.4*	*48.2*	*55.3*	*60.8*	*65.8*	*68.7*	*71.3*	*72.8*	*80.6*	*87.1*	*91.0*	*93.0*	*94.6*	*95.4*	*96.1*	*99.6*	*100.1*

TABLE XXIII

ILL ACTIVITY BY VARIOUS TYPES OF LIBRARIES

LIBRARY TYPE		NO. OF TRANS.	PUBLIC	ACADEMIC	SPECIAL	SCHOOL	GOVERNMENT	HOSP-MED.	NO ENTRY
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	B	2504	51.0	29.0	0.4	0.4	8.5	0.1	10.6
	L	*9314*	*95.2*	*3.4*	*0.4*	*0.5*	*0.1*	*0.3*	*0.1*
PUBLIC LIB.	B	2094	60.5	3.7	0.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	34.5
	L	*1093*	*91.3*	*3.9*	*0.0*	*3.8*	*0.0*	*0.7*	*0.4*
STATE COLLEGES	B	814	5.9	72.1	1.9	0.0	8.4	9.4	2.2
	L	*938*	*23.3*	*69.8*	*1.4*	*0.0*	*0.9*	*4.6*	*0.0*
COMMUNITY COLL.	B	151	14.6	80.1	0.0	0.0	0.7	4.6	0.0
	L	*82*	*46.3*	*45.1*	*2.4*	*3.7*	*0.0*	*2.4*	*0.0*
STATE RELATED UNIV.	B	153	2.6	77.8	5.9	0.0	7.8	1.3	4.6
	L	*267*	*17.4*	*70.3*	*4.7*	*0.0*	*2.5*	*5.1*	*0.0*
PRIVATE COLL.	B	3632	5.9	84.9	2.4	0.1	2.3	3.8	0.5
	L	*4834*	*11.1*	*75.6*	*7.8*	*0.2*	*0.7*	*3.7*	*0.8*
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	B	420	3.2	38.3	17.4	0.0	0.9	39.8	0.5
	L	*1378*	*5.3*	*44.8*	*11.9*	*0.0*	*0.5*	*37.0*	*0.5*
THEOL. SEM.	B	41	17.1	78.0	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*79*	*10.1*	*64.6*	*12.7*	*1.3*	*1.3*	*0.0*	*10.1*
JUNIOR COLL.	B	7	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*3*	*100.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	B	13	7.7	92.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*16*	*12.5*	*68.8*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*18.8*	*0.0*	*0.0*
LAW LIBRARIES	B	13	0.0	0.0	7.7	0.0	92.3	0.0	0.0
	L	*5*	*0.0*	*20.0*	*40.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*40.0*	*0.0*
MEDICAL LIB.	B	1253	0.7	13.6	8.0	0.7	3.4	73.1	0.4
	L	*2262*	*0.6*	*18.3*	*8.3*	*0.5*	*1.9*	*69.9*	*0.3*
INSTITUTIONAL	B	364	2.7	24.1	0.0	0.3	4.8	68.1	0.0
	L	*157*	*1.9*	*11.6*	*0.6*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*85.9*	*0.0*
GOVERNMENT	B	62	0.0	47.6	0.0	1.6	15.9	4.9	0.0
	L	*216*	*9.3*	*19.9*	*19.4*	*0.5*	*50.9*	*0.0*	*0.0*
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	B	11	0.0	81.8	9.1	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0
	L	*81*	*16.0*	*56.8*	*3.7*	*22.2*	*1.2*	*0.0*	*0.0*
SPECIAL PROFIT	B	431	12.5	26.7	49.4	0.5	1.2	3.0	6.7
	L	*19*	*0.0*	*5.3*	*89.5*	*0.0*	*5.3*	*0.0*	*0.0*
STATE LIBRARY	B	65	7.7	78.5	1.5	0.0	7.7	3.1	1.5
	L	*1010*	*23.8*	*65.3*	*3.0*	*0.0*	*1.0*	*6.9*	*0.0*
PENN STATE U.	B	495	12.1	74.7	5.1	0.0	7.1	1.0	0.0
	L	*1350*	*20.0*	*52.2*	*24.4*	*0.0*	*3.3*	*0.0*	*0.0*
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	B	47	12.8	23.4	4.3	0.0	59.6	0.0	0.0
	L	*1010*	*89.1*	*6.9*	*3.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*1.0*	*0.0*
TOTALS	B	12570	23.8	45.9	4.3	0.2	4.6	12.6	8.5
	L	*24115*	*50.8*	*31.2*	*5.2*	*0.6*	*1.2*	*10.7*	*0.3*

TABLE XXIV

BORROWING AND LENDING AS A FUNCTION OF LIBRARY SIZE

LIBRARY TYPE		NO. OF TRANS.	OVER 250000 VOL.	50000-250000 VOL.	UNDER 50000 VOL.	UNKNOWN	NO ENTRY
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	B	2504	39.8	22.6	11.3	13.3	13.1
	L	*9314*	*3.6*	*41.2*	*49.5*	*4.5*	*1.2*
PUBLIC LIB.	B	2094	12.9	39.0	5.1	9.4	33.5
	L	*1093*	*3.6*	*33.5*	*54.6*	*7.9*	*0.4*
STATE COLL.	B	814	42.4	16.3	5.2	31.0	5.1
	L	*938*	*21.5*	*34.7*	*6.0*	*33.3*	*4.5*
COMMUNITY COLL.	B	151	27.2	31.1	1.3	39.1	1.3
	L	*82*	*4.9*	*53.7*	*8.5*	*32.9*	*0.0*
STATE RELATED UNIV.	B	153	70.6	17.0	0.0	7.8	4.6
	L	*267*	*44.2*	*21.4*	*6.8*	*26.1*	*1.5*
PRIVATE COLL.	B	3632	43.5	41.7	2.1	8.0	4.8
	L	*4834*	*27.4*	*39.9*	*6.4*	*10.9*	*15.4*
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	B	420	60.6	28.1	10.0	0.0	1.4
	L	*1378*	*29.6*	*23.3*	*39.9*	*5.1*	*2.1*
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	B	41	19.5	24.4	2.4	53.7	0.0
	L	*79*	*35.4*	*17.7*	*6.3*	*30.4*	*10.1*
JUNIOR COLL.	B	7	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*3*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*33.3*	*66.7*	*0.0*
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	B	13	53.8	46.2	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*16*	*6.3*	*6.3*	*6.3*	*81.3*	*0.0*
LAW LIBRARIES	B	13	0.0	84.6	15.4	0.0	0.0
	L	*5*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*0.0*	*100.0*	*0.0*
MEDICAL LIB.	B	1253	46.3	20.5	10.5	20.3	2.5
	L	*2262*	*7.2*	*13.2*	*53.8*	*24.9*	*0.9*
INSTITUTIONAL	B	364	39.8	15.4	12.9	32.0	0.0
	L	*157*	*1.8*	*6.9*	*41.1*	*50.3*	*0.0*
GOVERNMENT	B	61	8.1	13.0	13.0	65.9	0.0
	L	*216*	*1.4*	*5.1*	*1.9*	*91.2*	*0.5*
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	B	11	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*81*	*49.4*	*9.9*	*1.2*	*35.8*	*3.7*
SPECIAL PROFIT	B	431	51.6	5.6	1.9	38.6	2.4
	L	*19*	*10.5*	*0.0*	*68.4*	*21.1*	*0.0*
STATE LIBRARY	B	65	70.8	10.8	6.2	4.6	7.7
	L	*1010*	*17.8*	*51.5*	*29.7*	*1.0*	*0.0*
PENN STATE UNIV.	B	495	67.7	32.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
	L	*1350*	*35.6*	*35.6*	*21.1*	*7.8*	*0.0*
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	B	47	42.6	4.3	0.0	6.4	46.8
	L	*1010*	*1.0*	*4.0*	*73.3*	*21.8*	*0.0*
TOTALS	B	12570	39.6	30.0	6.0	13.9	10.6
	L	*24115*	*13.8*	*34.3*	*36.4*	*11.4*	*4.0*

TABLE XXV

IN-STATE ILL ACTIVITY

TYPE OF LIBRARY	IN-STATE BORROWING, REQUESTS, %	IN-STATE BORROWING, FILLED TRANSACTIONS, %	IN-STATE LENDING, %
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTER	77.6	88.9	96.9
PUBLIC LIBRARY	66.3	98.5	99.0
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	82.2	88.9	95.0
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	84.1	90.9	87.1
STATE RELATED UNIV.	30.1	55.3	52.2
PRIVATE COLLEGES	90.2	49.1	87.2
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	81.4	93.3	54.0
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	78.0	78.6	55.7
JUNIOR COLLEGES	100.0	100.0	100.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	69.2	100.0	56.3
LAW LIBRARIES	92.3	100.0	100.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	86.8	91.2	96.2
INSTITUTIONAL	88.7	96.7	91.1
GOVERNMENT	67.2	70.6	13.5
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	0.0	0.0	25.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	74.7	90.0	68.8
STATE LIBRARY	83.0	100.0	95.0
PENN STATE UNIV.	65.7	73.6	62.9
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	59.6	50.0	92.9
COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS-PHILA.	—	—	73.5
TOTALS	79.8	91.1	84.4

TABLE XXVI

ILL ACTIVITY WITHIN 25 MILES

TYPE OF LIBRARY	BORROWING WITHIN 25 MILES, %	LENDING WITHIN 25 MILES, %
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTER	29.3	45.3
PUBLIC LIBRARY	66.4	85.2
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	14.8	17.2
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	42.0	39.0
STATE RELATED UNIVERSITIES	11.0	12.1
PRIVATE COLLEGES	52.2	56.8
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	73.3	40.6
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	31.7	16.9
JUNIOR COLLEGES	85.7	33.3
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	69.2	50.0
LAW LIBRARIES	7.7	100.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	61.6	41.9
INSTITUTIONAL	48.5	58.8
GOVERNMENT	61.3	3.2
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	0.0	13.6
SPECIAL PROFIT	50.5	73.7
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	6.5	7.9
PENN STATE UNIVERSITY	0.0	0.0
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH	6.4	68.3
SUMMARY	45.0	43.7

TABLE XXVII

ILL ACTIVITY WITHIN SAME NETWORK

TYPE OF LIBRARY	BORROWING (TOTAL), %	BORROWING (IN-STATE ONLY) %	LENDING (TOTAL), %	LENDING (IN-STATE ONLY), %
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTER	52.3	59.3	64.2	68.1
PUBLIC LIBRARY	90.9	92.0	90.0	90.9
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	42.8	50.8	46.6	49.0
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	51.0	57.5	64.6	73.6
STATE RELATED UNIV.	9.0	4.4	14.8	22.6
PRIVATE COLLEGES	71.1	77.8	69.7	79.2
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	55.9	68.7	39.6	63.0
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	53.8	72.4	35.7	61.5
JUNIOR COLLEGES	71.4	71.4	66.7	66.7
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	15.4	22.2	6.3	11.1
LAW LIBRARIES	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	90.9	93.6	90.2	92.8
INSTITUTIONAL	77.7	86.0	85.2	85.3
GOVERNMENT	34.1	21.7	6.9	14.3
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	0.0	—	2.5	10.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	29.6	42.9	42.9	55.6
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	58.7	71.1	49.5	52.3
PENN STATE UNIV.	60.6	86.2	44.1	44.6
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	14.9	25.0	82.2	88.3
SUMMARY	65.7	73.7	64.0	72.0

TABLE XXVIII

BORROWING LIBRARY'S REASON FOR CHOICE OF LENDER

LIBRARY TYPE	IN-STATE DATA				TOTAL DATA			
	LOCAL ILL REQ.	KNOWN TO HAVE	"LIKELY" SOURCE	IDENTIFIED SOURCE	LOCAL ILL REQ.	KNOWN TO HAVE	"LIKELY" SOURCE	IDENTIFIED SOURCE
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	2.3	10.8	4.7	82.2	3.2	9.9	3.9	83.0
PUBLIC LIBRARY	79.1	14.1	3.4	3.4	81.6	12.1	2.8	3.5
STATE OWNED COLL.	0.0	15.3	7.3	77.5	0.0	15.6	6.7	77.7
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	3.9	14.2	7.1	74.8	3.3	20.5	6.0	70.2
STATE RELATED UNIV.	0.0	58.6	6.9	34.5	0.0	47.4	15.8	36.8
PRIVATE COLLEGES	15.5	9.9	17.0	57.6	14.1	10.4	17.0	58.6
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	0.0	36.4	0.7	62.8	0.0	34.6	1.5	63.9
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	0.0	28.1	6.3	65.6	0.0	29.3	7.3	63.4
JUNIOR COLLEGES	0.0	71.4	14.3	14.3	0.0	71.4	14.3	14.3
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	0.0	28.6	0.0	71.4	0.0	18.2	0.0	81.8
LAW LIBRARIES	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	46.2	53.8	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	27.9	21.6	2.9	47.6	25.3	20.5	2.6	51.6
INSTITUTIONAL	23.7	7.4	6.6	62.2	21.0	9.3	5.9	63.8
GOVERNMENT	13.0	26.1	0.0	60.9	7.0	41.9	0.0	51.2
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	—	—	—	—	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	0.0	50.8	8.7	40.5	0.0	48.5	7.9	43.6
STATE LIBRARY	0.0	22.2	1.9	75.9	0.0	18.5	7.7	73.8
PENN STATE UNIV.	0.0	1.5	4.6	93.8	0.0	3.0	5.1	91.9
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH.	0.0	3.7	0.0	96.3	0.0	9.3	0.0	90.7
SUMMARY	20.3	14.6	8.6	56.4	19.8	14.6	8.1	57.4

TABLE XXIX

BIBLIOGRAPHIC VERIFICATION SOURCES

	OCLC, %		NUC %		OTHER %		UNKNOWN %		BORROWER DID NOT VERIFY %	
LENDING LIBRARY	IN-STATE	TOTAL	IN-STATE	TOTAL	IN-STATE	TOTAL	IN-STATE	TOTAL	IN-STATE	TOTAL
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	22.3	25.5	0.2	0.2	27.9	26.3	15.8	16.1	33.2	31.4
PUBLIC LIBRARY	2.5	2.7	0.2	0.2	23.4	23.5	64.7	64.4	7.6	7.5
STATE OWNED COLL.	24.5	27.3	1.3	1.3	25.1	23.8	41.1	39.8	7.7	7.3
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	43.1	46.3	2.8	3.7	20.8	18.3	16.7	17.1	15.3	13.4
STATE RELATED UNIVERSITIES	31.4	29.2	10.4	13.0	19.4	19.1	20.8	19.3	15.9	18.3
PRIVATE COLLEGES	18.6	19.4	6.4	10.4	26.0	25.0	19.6	18.5	19.5	17.4
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIV.	16.4	18.4	1.0	14.8	47.8	39.3	15.0	10.2	19.7	17.8
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	20.0	13.9	10.0	19.0	12.9	12.7	30.0	17.7	17.5	21.5
JUNIOR COLLEGES	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	66.7	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
SPECIALIZED SCH.	11.1	6.3	0.0	31.3	22.2	25.0	66.7	37.5	0.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	60.0	60.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	0.0	0.6	3.3	3.2	69.1	68.1	8.8	8.6	18.2	18.8
INSTITUTIONAL	2.1	1.9	0.0	0.0	20.2	27.6	74.9	68.0	2.8	2.5
GOVERNMENT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.2	92.9	96.3	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	0.0	1.2	30.0	40.7	25.0	18.5	25.0	23.5	10.0	7.4
SPECIAL PROFIT	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	31.6	66.7	68.4
STATE LIBRARY	30.2	30.7	3.1	4.0	39.6	38.6	9.4	8.9	17.7	17.8
PENN STATE UNIV.	17.5	13.3	1.8	6.7	54.4	46.7	3.5	3.3	22.8	30.0
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH.	13.8	13.9	1.1	2.0	1.1	3.0	0.0	0.0	83.0	80.2
SUMMARY	17.9	19.2	2.2	4.4	32.3	30.8	18.5	18.1	26.7	25.2

TABLE XXX

BORROWERS' USE OF OCLC vs. OTHER FORMS OF BIBLIOGRAPHIC VERIFICATION

	IN-STATE		OUT-OF-STATE			
	NO. OF ITEMS		NO. OF ITEMS		TOTAL NO. OF ITEMS	
LENDING LIBRARY	OCLC	OTHER	OCLC	OTHER	OCLC	OTHER
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTER	1960	2470	435	4	2395	2474
PUBLIC LIBRARY	27	255	3	4	30	259
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	216	233	40	2	256	235
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	31	17	7	1	38	18
STATE RELATED UNIV.	44	42	34	44	78	86
PRIVATE COLLEGES	778	1356	157	357	935	1713
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	122	363	131	382	253	745
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	8	9	3	16	11	25
JUNIOR COLLEGES	0	2	0	0	0	2
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	1	2	0	7	1	9
LAW LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	1	1573	13	38	14	1611
INSTITUTIONAL	3	29	0	14	3	43
GOVERNMENT	0	1	0	6	0	7
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	0	11	1	37	1	48
SPECIAL PROFIT	0	0	0	0	0	0
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	290	410	20	20	310	430
PENN STATE UNIVERSITY	150	490	30	230	180	720
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	130	20	10	30	140	50
TOTALS	3761	7283	884	1192	4645	8475
PERCENT	34.1	65.9	42.6	57.4	35.4	64.6

TABLE XXXI
CONSORTIA AND OTHER SOURCES
USED FOR LOCATION IDENTIFICATION

SOURCE	LOCATION IDENTIFICATION REPORTED TO LENDING LIBRARIES IN-STATE %	LOCATION IDENTIFICATION REPORTED TO LENDING LIBRARIES TOTAL %	LOCATION IDENTIFICATION REPORTED BY BORROWING LIBRARY IN-STATE %	LOCATION IDENTIFICATION REPORTED BY BORROWING LIBRARY TOTAL %
OCLC	17.8	19.6	16.4	18.0
LOCAL CAT. or UNION LIST	13.7	14.0	16.6	15.8
ULC MICRO	1.3	1.2	3.3	2.7
PALINET/ULC	1.1	1.0	2.3	2.1
PRLC	0.7	0.6	1.8	1.9
TCLC	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.9
ACLCP	2.6	2.3	6.4	5.1
LVAIC	0.9	0.8	1.3	1.0
SLC	0.1	0.1	0.5	0.5
NEPBC	0.6	0.5	1.0	0.8
MERMLS	2.7	2.7	1.9	1.7
OTHER	2.6	3.6	2.1	2.4
DID NOT IDENTIFY OR UNKNOWN	55.3	53.1	45.4	47.0

TABLE XXXII

BORROWER'S MEANS OF LOCATION VERIFICATION

LENDING LIBRARY	IN-STATE			OUT-OF-STATE			TOTAL		
	OCLC	LOCAL CATALOG	OTHER	OCLC	LOCAL CATALOG	OTHER	OCLC	LOCAL CATALOG	OTHER
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	2164	739	79	449	4	1	2613	743	80
PUBLIC LIBRARY	54	689	159	5	0	0	59	689	159
STATE OWNED COLL.	232	143	218	43	3	0	275	146	218
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	34	15	17	9	0	0	43	15	17
STATE RELATED UNIV.	65	25	8	42	46	3	107	71	11
PRIVATE COLLEGES	497	225	1204	160	74	264	657	299	1468
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	122	79	85	131	306	15	253	385	100
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	12	5	9	10	11	1	22	16	10
JUNIOR COLLEGES	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1
LAW LIBRARIES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	1	622	635	12	5	6	13	627	641
INSTITUTIONAL	6	81	4	0	0	14	6	81	18
GOVERNMENT	0	1	1	38	14	0	38	15	1
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	0	6	7	1	11	20	1	17	27
SPECIAL PROFIT	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	5	1
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	330	50	160	30	0	20	360	50	180
PENN STATE UNIV.	45	210	135	15	0	60	60	210	195
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	190	0	50	30	10	30	220	10	80
TOTALS	3753	2894	2775	975	487	434	4728	3381	3209
PERCENT	39.8	30.7	29.5	51.4	25.7	22.9	41.8	29.9	28.4

TABLE XXXIII

EFFECT OF ACCESS TO OCLC TERMINALS ON LOCATION

IDENTIFICATION BY BORROWING LIBRARIES

A. BORROWING IN-STATE

	NO. OF ITEMS	IDENTIFIED ON OCLC		IDENTIFIED WITH LOCALLY AVAILABLE CATALOG		OTHERWISE IDENTIFIED	
		NO.	PERCENT	NO.	PERCENT	NO.	PERCENT
WITH ACCESS TO TERMINAL	4416	1531	34.7	1143	25.9	1742	39.4
WITHOUT ACCESS TO TERMINAL	1168	111	9.5	520	44.5	537	46.0
TOTALS	5584	1642	29.4	1663	29.8	2279	40.8
B. BORROWING OUT-OF-STATE							
WITH ACCESS TO TERMINAL	987	592	60.0	220	22.2	175	17.7
WITHOUT ACCESS TO TERMINAL	235	29	12.3	108	46.0	98	41.7
TOTALS	1222	621	50.8	328	26.8	273	22.3
C. TOTAL BORROWERS							
WITH ACCESS TO TERMINAL	5403	2123	39.3	1363	25.2	1917	35.5
WITHOUT ACCESS TO TERMINAL	1403	140	10.0	628	44.8	635	45.3
TOTALS	6806	2263	33.3	1991	29.2	2552	37.5

TABLE XXXIV

REQUEST TRANSMISSION MEDIUM
AS REPORTED BY

	LENDING LIBRARIES	BORROWING LIBRARIES
PHONE	15.1	9.1
MAIL	43.1	42.7
TWX	27.9	33.1
OTHER	13.6	12.7
NO ENTRY	0.3	2.4

TABLE XXXV

FILL RATE

	BORROWING						LENDING					
	IN-STATE			TOTAL			IN-STATE			TOTAL		
LIBRARY TYPE	FILLED	NOT FILLED	PENDING	FILLED	NOT FILLED	PENDING	FILLED	NOT FILLED	PENDING	FILLED	NOT FILLED	PENDING
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	59.0	14.1	24.1	51.7	14.4	30.2	62.2	35.0	2.7	60.6	36.7	2.6
PUBLIC LIBRARY	61.2	9.3	24.6	41.3	14.1	37.9	91.5	8.2	0.1	91.4	8.2	0.2
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	67.3	13.4	17.9	62.6	16.6	19.6	81.8	16.5	1.5	80.7	17.5	1.5
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	69.3	11.0	18.1	64.2	15.2	19.2	93.1	2.8	4.2	89.0	7.3	3.7
STATE RELATED UNIV.	47.8	2.2	50.0	27.5	7.2	65.4	54.3	45.7	0.0	59.7	39.9	0.4
PRIVATE COLLEGES	62.8	31.8	5.0	60.2	30.9	8.0	64.5	35.4	0.1	64.6	34.6	0.2
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	73.2	16.5	10.3	64.2	17.1	18.8	74.2	24.9	0.9	63.4	36.1	0.5
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	65.6	31.3	3.1	65.9	24.4	9.8	75.0	25.0	0.0	70.9	19.0	0.0
JUNIOR COLLEGES	85.7	14.3	0.0	85.7	14.3	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	33.3	22.2	44.4	30.8	23.1	46.2	88.9	11.1	0.0	81.3	18.8	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	75.0	8.3	16.7	69.2	7.7	23.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	84.1	4.1	4.4	79.2	5.5	8.9	76.3	23.7	0.0	75.7	24.1	0.0
INSTITUTIONAL	60.1	10.7	29.3	60.3	12.2	27.5	88.9	11.1	0.0	89.9	10.1	0.0
GOVERNMENT	87.9	2.4	7.2	90.2	3.3	4.9	96.4	3.6	0.0	90.3	9.7	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	—	—	—	54.5	18.2	27.3	35.0	65.0	0.0	27.2	72.8	0.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	76.8	8.5	10.8	67.2	6.5	21.8	83.3	16.7	0.0	78.9	21.1	0.0
STATE LIB. OF PA.	48.1	24.1	27.8	40.0	26.2	33.8	83.3	16.7	0.0	83.2	16.8	0.0
PENN STATE UNIV.	81.5	16.9	1.5	71.7	18.2	10.1	71.9	26.3	1.8	74.4	24.4	1.1
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PITTSBURGH	50.0	7.1	42.9	55.3	8.5	36.2	34.0	66.0	0.0	34.7	65.3	0.0
SUMMARY	65.8	17.9	13.9	57.9	18.2	20.9	67.3	31.3	1.3	66.3	32.2	1.2

TABLE XXXVI

FORM OF LOAN - LENDING LIBRARY

LENDING LIBRARY	IN-STATE				TOTAL			
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF ITEMS	ORIGINAL%	PHOTO-COPY %	MICRO-FILM %	NO. OF ITEMS	ORIGINAL %	PHOTO-COPY %	MICRO-FILM %
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	5413	97.5	2.5	0.0	5594	97.6	2.6	0.0
PUBLIC LIBRARY	976	96.3	3.7	0.0	985	96.3	3.7	0.0
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	722	38.8	56.9	4.3	756	41.0	54.6	4.4
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	67	83.6	16.4	0.0	73	84.9	15.1	0.0
STATE RELATED UNIV.	71	94.4	2.8	2.8	154	91.6	2.6	5.8
PRIVATE COLLEGES	2692	58.9	40.8	0.3	3119	61.6	37.8	0.6
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	552	43.5	56.5	0.0	875	44.9	55.1	0.0
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	30	60.0	40.0	0.0	56	71.4	28.6	0.0
JUNIOR COLLEGES	3	100.0	0.0	0.0	3	100.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	8	87.5	12.5	0.0	13	84.6	15.4	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	5	80.0	20.0	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	1628	11.4	88.6	0.0	1683	11.2	88.8	0.0
INSTITUTIONAL	126	38.9	61.1	0.0	140	35.0	65.0	0.0
GOVERNMENT	27	25.9	74.1	0.0	195	34.4	65.6	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	7	57.1	42.9	0.0	22	36.4	59.1	4.6
SPECIAL PROFIT	10	20.0	80.0	0.0	15	20.0	80.0	0.0
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	800	67.5	31.2	1.3	1010	67.9	31.0	1.2
PENN STATE UNIVERSITY	615	31.7	68.3	0.0	1005	46.3	53.7	0.0
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	300	100.0	0.0	0.0	330	100.0	0.0	0.0
SUMMARY	14052	69.5	30.2	0.4	15861	69.2	30.4	0.5

TABLE XXXVII

FORM OF LOAN - BORROWING LIBRARY

BORROWING LIBRARY	IN-STATE				TOTAL			
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF ITEMS	ORIGINAL%	PHOTO-COPY %	MICRO-FILM %	NO. OF ITEMS %	ORIGINAL %	PHOTO-COPY %	MICRO-FILM %
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	1138	85.2	11.6	3.1	1281	85.9	10.6	3.4
PUBLIC LIB.	844	91.6	6.6	1.8	857	91.7	6.5	1.8
STATE OWNED COLL.	453	36.2	63.1	0.7	509	40.1	58.3	1.6
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	87	77.0	20.7	2.3	96	78.1	19.8	2.1
STATE RELATED UNIV.	22	68.2	31.8	0.0	42	64.2	33.3	2.4
PRIVATE COLLEGES	2047	50.2	49.1	0.7	2175	51.3	47.8	0.8
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	250	31.2	68.0	0.8	270	34.1	65.2	0.7
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	21	57.1	42.9	0.0	27	59.2	37.0	3.7
JUNIOR COLLEGES	6	100.0	0.0	0.0	6	100.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	3	33.3	66.7	0.0	4	50.0	5.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	9	44.4	55.6	0.0	9	44.4	55.6	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	906	21.6	77.9	0.4	984	20.4	79.1	0.4
INSTITUTIONAL	193	31.6	68.4	0.0	219	39.7	60.3	0.0
GOVERNMENT	36	83.3	16.7	0.0	55	72.7	27.3	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	—	—	—	—	5	20.0	80.0	0.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	246	24.0	76.0	0.0	289	20.0	80.0	0.0
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	26	34.6	65.4	0.0	26	34.6	65.4	0.0
PENN STATE LIBRARY	265	41.5	58.5	0.0	355	49.3	47.9	2.0
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	14	7.1	0.0	92.9	26	38.5	0.0	61.5
SUMMARY	6566	54.6	44.1	1.4	7236	55.4	42.9	1.7

TABLE XXXVIII

LOAN DELIVERY METHOD TO BORROWING LIBRARY

BORROWING LIBRARY	IN-STATE				OUT-OF-STATE		
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF ITEMS	MAIL %	IDS %	OTHER %	NO. OF ITEMS	MAIL %	OTHER %
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	1082	21.0	54.3	24.8	124	90.3	9.7
PUBLIC LIBRARY	803	27.9	11.3	60.8	14	64.2	35.8
STATE OWNED COLL.	447	21.5	76.7	1.8	57	98.2	1.8
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	82	52.4	15.9	31.7	7	100.0	0.0
STATE RELATED UNIV.	22	4.6	72.7	22.7	18	94.4	5.6
PRIVATE COLLEGES	2017	7.3	63.9	28.8	115	98.3	1.7
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	250	12.8	72.0	15.2	20	90.0	10.0
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	21	85.7	14.3	0.0	6	83.3	16.7
JUNIOR COLLEGES	5	20.0	0.0	80.0	0	—	—
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	3	66.7	33.3	0.0	1	100.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	5	100.0	0.0	0.0	0	100.0	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	869	43.6	33.0	22.4	66	89.1	10.9
INSTITUTIONAL	187	40.6	59.4	0.0	26	100.0	0.0
GOVERNMENT	36	25.0	0.0	75.0	19	100.0	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	—	—	—	—	6	100.0	0.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	241	88.8	5.0	6.2	41	100.0	0.0
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	14	14.3	85.7	0.0	0	—	—
PENN STATE UNIV.	265	32.1	67.9	0.0	90	100.0	0.0
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	13	100.0	0.0	0.0	12	100.0	0.0
SUMMARY	6362	24.8	49.2	26.1	622	96.6	3.4

TABLE XXXIX

LOAN DELIVERY METHOD BY LENDING LIBRARY

LENDING LIBRARY	IN-STATE				OUT-OF-STATE		
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF ITEMS	MAIL %	IDS %	OTHER %	NO. OF ITEMS	MAIL %	OTHER %
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	5287	16.0	21.4	62.6	173	98.8	1.2
PUBLIC LIBRARY	945	8.6	3.9	87.5	9	88.9	11.1
STATE OWNED COLL.	695	16.6	80.1	3.3	33	100.0	0.0
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	57	21.1	64.9	14.0	6	100.0	0.0
STATE RELATED UNIV.	74	21.6	78.4	0.0	83	97.6	2.4
PRIVATE COLLEGES	2550	13.4	43.4	43.3	348	96.6	3.4
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	551	46.6	33.4	20.0	322	100.0	0.0
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	30	63.3	36.7	0.0	26	100.0	0.0
JUNIOR COLLEGES	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0	—	—
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	8	25.0	12.5	62.5	5	100.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	2	50.0	0.0	50.0	0	—	—
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	1508	74.3	12.7	13.0	37	100.0	0.0
INSTITUTIONAL	85	60.0	40.0	0.0	15	100.0	0.0
GOVERNMENT	28	83.3	0.0	16.7	164	100.0	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	7	100.0	0.0	0.0	9	100.0	0.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	5	80.0	20.0	0.0	5	80.0	20.0
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	790	21.5	76.0	2.5	40	100.0	0.0
PENN STATE UNIV.	615	31.7	68.3	0.0	390	96.2	3.8
CARNEGIE LIB. OF PGH	310	90.3	9.7	0.0	30	100.0	0.0
SUMMARY	13549	26.1	32.5	41.4	1695	97.6	2.4

TABLE XL

REASON NOT FILLED - BORROWING LIBRARY

BORROWING LIBRARY	IN-STATE						OUT-OF-STATE					
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF ITEMS	UNKNOWN %	NOT OWNED %	LOST %	IN USE %	DOES NOT CIRCULATE %	NO. OF ITEMS	UNKNOWN %	NOT OWNED %	LOST %	IN USE %	DOES NOT CIRCULATE
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	263	1.1	13.3	14.8	55.1	15.6	82	29.2	2.4	7.3	34.1	22.0
PUBLIC LIBRARY	128	0.8	68.0	0.8	18.0	12.5	49	0.0	71.4	6.1	20.4	2.0
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	87	4.6	40.2	20.7	14.9	18.4	32	3.1	37.5	46.9	18.8	25.0
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	14	0.0	28.6	7.2	42.9	21.4	9	0.0	11.1	11.1	33.3	44.4
STATE RELATED UNIV.	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	10	0.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	60.0
PRIVATE COLLEGES	1032	1.3	76.5	9.2	8.9	4.4	79	0.0	49.3	5.1	21.5	24.1
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	57	0.0	56.1	8.8	19.3	14.0	11	0.0	28.6	0.0	28.6	42.9
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	10	10.0	30.0	10.0	30.0	20.0	0	—	—	—	—	—
JUNIOR COLLEGES	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0	—	—	—	—	—
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	—	—	—	—	—
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	43	14.0	48.8	20.9	16.3	0.0	25	36.0	20.0	44.0	0.0	0.0
INSTITUTIONAL	34	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	10	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
GOVERNMENT	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	27	25.9	55.6	11.1	7.4	0.0	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	12	0.0	16.7	0.0	58.3	25.0	3	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0
PENN STATE UNIV.	45	0.0	33.3	11.1	33.3	22.2	35	0.0	42.9	0.0	5.7	51.4
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SUMMARY	1762	2.0	60.0	11.2	18.6	8.3	350	10.0	33.1	12.6	22.3	22.0

TABLE XLI
REASON NOT FILLED - LENDING LIBRARY

LENDING LIBRARY	IN-STATE						OUT-OF-STATE					
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF ITEMS	UNKNOWN %	NOT OWNED %	LOST %	IN USE %	DOES NOT CIRCULATE %	NO. OF ITEMS	UNKNOWN %	NOT OWNED %	LOST %	IN USE %	DOES NOT CIRCULATE%
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	3069	0.4	45.1	3.0	51.2	0.3	338	0.3	6.2	1.8	88.5	3.3
PUBLIC LIBRARY	87	0.0	3.5	5.8	88.5	3.5	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
STATE OWNED COLL.	132	6.1	34.1	22.0	24.2	13.6	14	0.0	14.3	21.4	50.0	14.3
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	4	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
STATE RELATED UNIV.	63	0.0	22.2	33.3	33.3	12.7	42	0.0	35.7	23.8	4.8	35.7
PRIVATE COLLEGES	1470	1.0	71.0	11.8	11.2	5.0	191	12.0	15.2	18.8	22.5	31.4
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	185	7.6	27.6	7.6	38.4	20.0	299	0.0	34.4	2.3	14.7	48.5
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	9	0.0	77.8	11.1	0.0	11.1	4	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0
JUNIOR COLLEGES	0	—	—	—	—	—	0	—	—	—	—	—
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	1	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	2	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	0	—	—	—	—	—	0	—	—	—	—	—
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	463	0.9	93.1	5.4	0.7	0.0	31	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
INSTITUTIONAL	16	12.5	68.8	18.8	0.0	0.0	0	—	—	—	—	—
GOVERNMENT	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20	0.0	95.0	5.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	11	9.1	27.3	0.0	0.0	63.6	45	4.4	31.1	0.0	0.0	64.4
SPECIAL PROFIT	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	160	12.5	37.5	43.3	6.3	0.0	10	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
PENN STATE UNIV.	225	6.7	53.3	0.0	13.3	26.7	105	14.3	57.1	0.0	0.0	28.6
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	620	0.0	38.7	0.0	58.1	3.2	40	0.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	75.0
SUMMARY	6516	1.4	52.4	6.7	35.9	3.6	1147	3.6	27.3	6.1	35.6	27.5

TABLE XLII

UNFILLED REQUEST DISPOSITION - LENDING LIBRARY

LENDING LIBRARY	IN-STATE				TOTAL			
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF ITEMS	SENT TO OTHER %	RETURNED %	OTHER %	NO. OF ITEMS	SENT TO OTHER %	RETURNED %	OTHER %
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	3045	19.1	32.5	48.5	3380	17.7	30.1	52.2
PUBLIC LIBRARY	82	42.7	7.3	50.0	82	42.7	7.3	50.0
STATE OWNED COLL.	118	0.0	99.2	0.8	137	0.0	97.8	2.2
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	2	0.0	100.0	0.0	5	0.0	80.0	20.0
STATE RELATED UNIV.	53	0.0	100.0	0.0	93	1.1	98.9	0.0
PRIVATE COLLEGES	1381	0.1	77.8	22.2	1521	0.3	79.4	20.3
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	137	15.3	84.7	0.0	399	5.3	93.0	1.8
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	9	0.0	100.0	0.0	14	0.0	100.0	0.0
JUNIOR COLLEGES	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	9	0.0	0.0	0.0	1	0.0	100.0	0.0
LAW LIBRARIES	5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	500	78.2	21.8	0.0	531	73.6	26.4	0.0
INSTITUTIONAL	6	0.0	100.0	0.0	6	0.0	100.0	0.0
GOVERNMENT	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	21	0.0	100.0	0.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	9	11.1	77.8	11.1	40	10.0	87.5	2.5
SPECIAL PROFIT	1	0.0	100.0	0.0	3	0.0	100.0	0.0
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	150	20.0	80.0	0.0	150	20.0	80.0	0.0
PENN STATE UNIV.	180	0.0	83.3	16.7	270	0.0	88.9	11.1
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	600	8.3	36.7	55.0	630	7.9	39.7	52.4
SUMMARY	6272	17.7	47.5	34.8	7281	15.6	50.3	34.1

TABLE XLIII

UNFILLED REQUEST DISPOSITION - BORROWING LIBRARY

BORROWING LIBRARY	IN-STATE			TOTAL		
		ITEM RE-REQUESTED			ITEM RE-REQUESTED	
LIBRARY TYPE	NO. OF ITEMS	YES	NO	NO. OF ITEMS	YES	NO
DISTRICT LIB. CENTER	212	77.4	22.6	276	74.2	25.7
PUBLIC LIBRARY	105	15.2	84.8	271	8.1	91.9
STATE OWNED COLL.	84	77.4	22.6	124	71.8	28.2
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	12	50.0	50.0	21	38.1	61.9
STATE RELATED UNIV.	1	100.0	0.0	11	72.7	27.3
PRIVATE COLLEGES	989	85.0	15.0	1064	84.0	16.0
PRIVATE STATE-AIDED UNIVERSITIES	54	83.3	16.7	69	87.0	13.0
THEOLOGICAL SEM.	7	28.6	71.4	7	28.6	71.4
JUNIOR COLLEGES	1	100.0	0.0	1	100.0	0.0
SPECIALIZED SCHOOLS	2	0.0	100.0	2	0.0	100.0
LAW LIBRARIES	1	0.0	100.0	1	0.0	100.0
MEDICAL LIBRARIES	42	83.3	16.7	48	75.0	25.0
INSTITUTIONAL	24	100.0	0.0	34	100.0	0.0
GOVERNMENT	1	100.0	0.0	2	50.0	50.0
SPECIAL NON-PROFIT	—	—	—	1	100.0	0.0
SPECIAL PROFIT	26	57.7	42.3	27	55.6	44.4
STATE LIBRARY OF PA	12	83.3	16.7	76	75.0	25.0
PENN STATE UNIV.	50	80.0	20.0	85	82.4	27.6
CARNEGIE LIBRARY OF PGH	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
SUMMARY	1626	78.0	22.0	2063	70.8	29.2

Table XLIV

OCLC Membership in Pennsylvania by Library Type

Type of Library	Number of Members
REGIONAL RESOURCE CENTERS	4
DISTRICT LIBRARY CENTERS	25
STATE OWNED COLLEGES	14
COMMUNITY COLLEGES	4
OTHER ACADEMIC	55
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES	4
MEDICAL	3
SPECIAL	4
INSTITUTIONAL	48*
GOVERNMENT	3**

*Cataloging done via terminal at State Library. No terminals on site.
**Members of FEDLINK

APPENDIX II

SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

PENNSYLVANIA BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS STUDY
PRLC, Beatty Hall, Chatham College
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15232 (412) 441-6409

March 10, 1978

Dear Colleague:

As you may know, a study of bibliographic access to materials in Pennsylvania libraries, co-sponsored by PRLC and PALINET, is being undertaken under the auspices of the State Library, with Federal support under Title III of LSCA.

With your help and the help of other librarians throughout the Commonwealth, we are exploring means of improving access to library resources with the ultimate goal of providing every citizen the information he or she needs regardless of his or her status or place of residence.

As one aspect of this study, we are surveying the interlibrary loan traffic in a representative sample of libraries of all types in all parts of the Commonwealth. Only this kind of a detailed survey can provide accurate information about present ILL activity that can be used as a basis for planning improvements.

To this end, we are asking your cooperation in completing the enclosed set of survey forms during the month of April 1978. During that month *only*, will you please complete one *BORROWING* form for each ILL or photocopy request sent out and one *LENDING* form for each ILL or photocopy request form received, up to a maximum of 100 transactions of each type, sampled during the month.

We are sending what we believe to be a sufficient number of forms for each library, but if you run out of forms before the end of the month, it is not necessary to copy any more forms. Please indicate total ILL activity during the month on the Summary form. More detailed instructions and definitions will be found on the enclosed sheets.

Please mail all completed forms to this office by May 5, 1978 for analysis which will determine future directions in this study. If you have any questions concerning this survey, please get in touch with me. Also, any suggestions for improving bibliographic access are more than welcome.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Alexander Strasser

Alexander Strasser
Project Director

AS:mmh
enclosures

PENNSYLVANIA BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS STUDY
Interlibrary Loan Survey

Instructions and Definitions

Summary Information Form:
Please complete at end of the month of April and return with the rest of the survey forms.

LENDING FORM
Fill out one form for each ILL or photocopy request received.

Item

1. Do not include any requests received before April 1.

2. Leave blank if still pending on April 30.

3. Check only one box.

4. Subject (Check one):

   Science & Technology: includes medicine, psychology.

   Humanities: includes the arts, literature, language, music, philosophy. Include such fiction as you would classify under "literature."

   Social Sciences: includes Sociology, Anthropology, Economics, History, Education, Political Science, Law.

   Old Fiction: Any adult fiction published before 1970. Also, any later fiction currently out of print.

   Contemporary Fiction: Adult fiction published in 1970 or later and currently in print.

   Children's and Y.A. Material: Material specifically produced for this audience and usually kept separate from the rest of the library's collection.

6. Borrowing library (check one):

   Academic library: a library forming part of a post-highschool institution of learning.

   Special library: A library serving either or profit or not-for-profit organization, with a collection focused on the needs of its parent organization.

   School library: includes elementary and highschool libraries, through 12th grade.

   Government Library: A library serving a unit of Municipal, County, State or Federal Government. These are usually special libraries but are not included in the "special library" category.

Item

8. Identification of Borrowing Library - include name (abbreviated, if necessary). Add NUC and OCLC Symbols, if possible.

11. Network - any formal or informal cooperative group set up to share resources and capabilities for the mutual benefit of the members. In this context, I.D.S. and OCLC are not considered networks.

13. - 14.

How did borrower verify location? Check only one box which may be located in either of the two lines.

The acronyms listed include:

PALINET	Pennsylvania Area Library Network
ULC-Micro	Microform ULC Catalog available in 6 locations
ULC	Union Library Catalog of Pennsylvania
TCLC	Tri-State College Library Cooperative
PRLC	Pittsburgh Regional Library Center
ACLCP	Associated College Libraries of Central Pennsylvania
LVAIC	Lehigh Valley Association of Independent College Libraries
SLC	Susquehanna Library Cooperative
NEPBC	Northeastern Pennsylvania Bibliographic Center
MERMLS	Mid-Eastern Regional Medical Library Service

15. Re-verification includes more than checking your own catalogue.

16. Request received - Check only one box for initial request, not e.g. for mail follow-up

BORROWING FORM

Definitions and instructions are the same as for *LENDING* form.

Item

13. Reason for choice of lending library "Requirement of local ILL procedure" - is referral required to a specific source, such as a District Library Center?

14. - 15.

Check only one box which may be located on either line.

16. How was request submitted? Check only one for the initial contact. For example, a telephone request followed by a mailed form should be checked only under "telephone."

mmh
3/14/78

PENNSYLVANIA BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS STUDY

Interlibrary Loan Survey

Summary Information

Institution Name _____ _____

Institution Address _____

NUC Symbol _____ OCLC Symbol _____

ILL Librarian _____

Telephone ( ) _____

Approximate Current Holdings (Volumes) _____

Approximate Holdings Not Available for ILL (including Reserve, Reference, Non-Circulating, Rare Items, etc.) _____

TOTAL ILL Activity Latest Year:

a. No. of Items Borrowed _____ _____

b. No of Items Loaned _____

ILL Activity in April 1978

a. No. of Items Borrowed _____ _____

b. No. of Items Loaned _____

(include photocopies sent or received)

mmh
3/14/78

Institution _____

PENNSYLVANIA BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS STUDY
Interlibrary *BORROWING* Survey

1. Date of Patron Request: /0/4/ / /
   mo. day

2. Date Item Requested by library: /0/4/ / /
   mo. day

3. Date Item Received by library: /0/4/ / /
   mo. day

Type of Item Requested:

	Monograph	Periodical	A/V Material	Technical Report	Other
4.	/_/ 1	/_/ 2	/_/ 3	/_/ 4	/_/ 5

Subject:

	Sci Tech	Humanities	Social Sciences	Other Non-Fiction	Old Fiction	Contemporary Fiction	Childrens/ Young Adult Material
5.	/_/ 1	/_/ 2	/_/ 3	/_/ 4	/_/ 5	/_/ 6	/_/ 7

6. Year of Publication: / / / / /

Lending library:

	Public	Academic	Special	School	Government	Hospitals/Medical
7.	/_/ 1	/_/ 2	/_/ 3	/_/ 4	/_/ 5	/_/ 6

Size of Lending Library:

	Over 250,000 Vols.	50,000 to 250,000 Vols.	Less than 50,000 Vols.	Unknown
8.	/_/ 1	/_/ 2	/_/ 3	/_/ 4

Identification of Lending Library:

9. Name / / / / / / NUC Symbol / / / / / / / / OCLC Symbol / / / /

Location of Lending Library:

10. IN State /_/ 1 OUT of State /_/ 2

11. Within 25 mi. /_/ 1 More than 25 mi. /_/ 2

(OVER)

Is Lending Library a member of your district or of a network to which you belong?

12. YES /__/ 1 NO /__/ 2

Reason for choice of lending library:

	Requirement of local ILL Procedure	Known to have Item	"Likely" Source	Source Location Verified
13.	/__/ 1	/__/ 2	/__/ 3	/__/ 4

How was location verified? (check only one)

	OCLC	Local Catalog or Union List	ULC Micro	PALINET ULC	PRLC	TCLC
14.	/__/ 1	/__/ 2	/__/ 3	/__/ 4	/__/ 5	/__/ 6

	ACLCP	LVAIC	SLC	NEPBC	MERMLS	Other Network
15.	/__/ 1	/__/ 2	/__/ 3	/__/ 4	/__/ 5	/__/ 6

16. How was request submitted? (check only one) Telephone /__/ 1 Mail /__/ 2 TWX /__/ 3 Other /__/ 4

17. Was standard ALA ILL form used? YES /__/ 1 NO /__/ 2

Outcome:

	Filled	Not Filled	Pending on April 30
18.	/__/ 1	/__/ 2	/__/ 3

Form of Item:

	Original	Photocopy	Microform
19.	/__/ 1	/__/ 2	/__/ 3

How was Item delivered?

	Mail	I.D.S.	Other Courier
20.	/__/ 1	/__/ 2	/__/ 3

Reason for not filling:

	Not Identified	Not Owned	Lost	In Use	Non-Circulating
21.	/__/ 1	/__/ 2	/__/ 3	/__/ 4	/__/ 5

22. Was Item re-requested? YES /__/ 1 NO /__/ 2

mmh
3/10/78

Institution_____

PENNSYLVANIA BIBLIOGRAPHIC ACCESS STUDY
Interlibrary *LENDING* Survey

1. Date Request Received by your library: /0/4/ / /

2. Date Disposed of by your library: /0/4/ / /

Type of Item Requested:

3.

Monograph	Periodical	A/V Material	Technical Report or Govt.Doc.	Other
/_/ 1	/_/ 2	/_/ 3	/_/ 4	/_/ 5

Subject:

4.

Sci Tech	Humanities	Social Sciences	Other Non-Fiction	Old Fiction	Contemporary Fiction	Childrens/ Young Adult Material
/_/ 1	/_/ 2	/_/ 3	/_/ 4	/_/ 5	/_/ 6	/_/ 7

5. Year of Publication: / / / / /

Borrowing Library:

6.

Public	Academic	Special	School	Government	Hospitals/ Medical
/_/ 1	/_/ 2	/_/ 3	/_/ 4	/_/ 5	/_/ 6

Size of Borrowing Library:

7.

Over 250,000 Vols.	50,000 to 250,000 Vols.	Less than 50,000 Vols.	Unknown
/_/ 1	/_/ 2	/_/ 3	/_/ 4

Identification of Borrowing Library:

8. Name / / / / / / NUC Symbol / / / / / / / / OCLC Symbol / / / /

Location of Borrowing Library:

9. IN State /_/ 1 OUT of State /_/ 2

Distance from Borrowing Library:

10. Within 25 mi. /_/ 1 More than 25 mi. /_/ 2

Is Borrowing Library a member of your district or of a network to which you belong?

11. YES /_/ 1 NO /_/ 2

(OVER)

How did borrower verify bibliographically?

12. OCLC /__/ 1 NUC /__/ 2 Other /__/ 3 Unknown /__/ 4 Did Not Verify /__/ 5

How did borrower verify location? (check only one)

13. OCLC /__/ 1 Local Catalog or Union List /__/ 2 ULC Micro /__/ 3 PALINET ULC /__/ 4 PRLC /__/ 5 TCLC /__/ 6 ACLCP /__/ 7 LVAIC /__/ 8 SLC /__/ 9

14. NEPBC /__/ 1 MERMLS /__/ 2 Other Network /__/ 3 Unknown /__/ 4 Not Verified /__/ 5

Did you re-verify Item bibliographically?

15. YES /__/ 1 NO /__/ 2

16. How was request received? (check only one) Telephone /__/ 1 Mail /__/ 2 TWX /__/ 3 Other /__/ 4

17. Was standard ALA ILL form used: YES /__/ 1 NO /__/ 2

Disposition of Request:

18. Filled /__/ 1 Not Filled /__/ 2 Pending on April 30 /__/ 3

Form of Loan

19. Original /__/ 1 Photocopy /__/ 2 Microform /__/ 3

Sent by

20. Mail /__/ 1 I.D.S. /__/ 2 Other Courier /__/ 3

Reason:

21. Not Identified /__/ 1 Not Owned /__/ 2 Lost /__/ 3 In Use /__/ 4 Non-Circulating /__/ 5

Unfilled request was:

22. Sent to Other Library /__/ 1 Returned to Sender /__/ 2 Other /__/ 3

mmh
3/10/78